

k with Tract 6.

5

A
D E F E N C E
O F
I N F A N T - B A P T I S M :
O R , A
V I N D I C A T I O N
O F T H E
A P P E N D I X *to the Plea for Infants.*
A G A I N S T

699. h 11
5

The Rev. Mr. JOSEPH BURROUGHS's *Defence*
of his Two Discourses, relating to positive In-
stitutions.

By C A L E B F L E M I N G ,
Author of the APPENDIX, &c.

For supporting one's own Sentiments, or for examining those of others, a Man needs no Apology.—But for personal ill Treatment, there can be no sufficient Excuse.

See an *Epistle* to WARBURTON.

Whoever engages in the Defence of a Party with the usual Violence, you may be satisfied, and may take it for a general Rule, has not his Zeal from Religion, but something which lies at Bottom, of a quite contrary Nature. GALE.

ZEAL for Truth arises from abundant Charity to the Souls of Men: So that CHARITY and ZEAL are nearly ally'd, if they are genuine. GROSVENOR.

L O N D O N :

Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe*, in *Pater-noster-Row*; and sold by R. KING, at the *Bible and Crown*, in *Fore-street*; and M. FENNER, at the *Turk's Head*, in *Gracechurch-street*. 1744. [PRICE 1s. 6d.]

A

PREFACE to the Reader.

IN the following Vindication, you will find, that I have endeavour'd to bring the matters under distinct heads of argument; which I have divided into sections. My reason was this, viz. to make the argument more easily understood, by freeing the memory from those blendings of ideas, which must have been the case, if I had pursued Mr. Burroughs's defence in that order in which it is wrote. — To the Reader there will indeed be somewhat more trouble in turning over to Mr. Burroughs's pages: But this, I hope, will be recompensed by the method taken.

The introduction is chiefly taken up in defending myself from the imputations of the writer; and in supporting the charge of bigotry laid against the party.

Sect. I. Respects positive institutions, their nature, design, periods; — shews, that Mr. Burroughs has carried their importance too high; by making mere will and pleasure a sufficient ground of obedience; and by denying that the gracious and useful purposes proposed in them, alters any thing in the nature of obligation. — The capacity and integrity of infant-baptizers virtually called in question by him. — The analogy between baptism

tism and circumcision.—The consent of the subject considered; or the profession of his own faith. — The righteousness fulfilled therein the same in infant-baptism, as in that of adult-baptism.

Sect. II. Upon our Lord's going from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John. Mr. Burroughs's sense of it only imaginary.

Sect. III. Upon proselyte-baptism, which shews, that proselytes must have had the water of separation applied to them, by virtue of the Mosaic constitution; tho' neither Josephus, Philo, nor any Talmudical writer had took notice of it, and it greatly assists us in accounting for John's coming to prepare men for the Messiah's kingdom by the baptism of repentance. Water-baptism not an institution of Jesus, or had not its origin in his appointment, but was a Jewish rite adopted by him.

Sect. IV. Infants the subjects of water-baptism. — It does not appear to be the mind of Christ, that none but adult persons should be baptized. — Our Lord's baptism in favour of infants. — If infants are equally the care of heaven now, as under former dispensations, this is a reason of their baptism. — Our Lord has given no such account of the ordinance of baptism as forbids them. — Nor is Dr. Gale's argument from the teaching, conclusive; for infants belong to the all nations that are to be baptized. — Circumcision was as much a seal to Abraham's seed as to himself. — No vast difference between its being a seal and a token. — Circumcision properly succeeded by baptism, tho' females had not the seal of circumcision in their flesh; they were equally included in the covenant

nant with the males.—If injury has been done to Philip in the debate between us, Mr. Burroughs has done it.

Sect. V. Upon the mode of baptism. The word βαπτίζω, 1 Cor. x. 2. cannot signify to plunge, or have an allusive correspondence with plunging, by an overwhelming or encompassing. — The allusive sense, when applied to the baptism of infants, much more easy and rational. — Mr. Burroughs's emphatical sense of εἰς, Mark i. 9. considered, and shewn not to be emphatical. The terms, coming up from, or out of the water, does no way explain the mode of baptism. — No more stress to be laid upon εἰς than upon ἀπὸ. — The distinction between baptō and baptizo.

In these sections, I have taken in those arguments, upon which Mr. Burroughs professes to lay the greatest stress; and, as far as I am capable of knowing myself, with a sincere and fervent regard for truth, and for the honour of Jesus.

I designed to have troubled the world no more with my thoughts on the subject of infant-baptism: but Mr. Burroughs's heavy charge of injurious, insolent treatment both of him, and of the whole body of Anabaptists, has made it needful I should take some notice of his defence. If Mr. Burroughs should give this vindication an unprejudic'd reading, I am in hopes he will not so severely censure me as he has done.

If the contrary should happen, and he thinks I have injur'd him, he is at liberty, to say whatever else he can of me, or of my writings, only let him have a regard to truth, and he is welcome. I
will

will promise him this, that whatever he shall discover in me, unworthy the Christian, I will not call it invective (b) ; but will secretly honour him for it ; tho' I dare not openly pay him such respect, for fear of provoking him again to charge me with hypocrisy (c). — If he is upon good grounds persuaded, that I am doing any disservice to the cause of true religion, or that I am injuring the interests of pure and genuine christianity, in my life or doctrine, the more he exposes me to contempt, the more he lessens my influence, and the better. — If I know myself, I would rather wear out the remainder of life, even bereaved of that friendship I now share from men, than be found making use of such provision to the dishonour of God, or to the propagation of falsehood. — But if Mr. Burroughs has nothing more to say, nothing better to say, than what is contained in his defence ; I hope he will excuse me from any farther notice of the controversy.

The Reader will not take offence, at my repeating the same reasoning in several parts of this Vindication ; since, he will find the same sort of argument with some variation, as to the light in which it is put, as frequently used by Mr. Burroughs, which has made such repetitions unavoidable.

I am, with all humility, and to the utmost of my ability, at the service of men,

C. F.

(b) *Def.* p. 7. l. 9.

(c) See the ground of this, *Def.* p. 9. begin.

THE INTRODUCTION.

AS Mr. BURROUGHS, in his defence of his two discourses, &c. has been pleased to treat my *personal character*, as well as that of my *writings*, with great freedom, I would here offer a few things in defence of my character, which is impeach'd by him.

Mr. Burroughs says, (a) "that I seem to expect *some advantage* to myself by *concealing* my name, in all the *ungenerous treatment* I give to others."

What he means by this insinuation, I do not well understand. — If he would intimate, that there is something in my *character*, which, if known, would prejudice the reputation of my writings; or discover any *deceit*, *hypocrisy*, or *mercenaryness* in my *aims* or *intentions*, it is, (thanks be to God) out of his power, or any man's else to make such discovery.

If he would insinuate, that I have any reason of *fear* or of *shame*, or have any servile dependence, either upon him, or upon any other *adult baptizer*, or *adult baptized*, he does me wrong, for I have none: And in my inquiries

(a) Def. p. 4.

after

after *truth*, I fear no man, nor stand in awe of the displeasure of any.

If he would insinuate, that I expected to be treated with more *caution* and *respect* by the *concealment* of my name; I can assure him, that I did only *expect* and *desire* to have the arguments I have advanced (in defence of infant-baptism) treated agreeably to their strength and degree of importance. Nor am I so much *unacquainted* with the world as to suppose, that men would conclude there was any thing either *better* or *worse* in my writings, on account of their being *anonymous*. — *Anonymous writings* are very common. — But whatever were my expectations, Mr. B. has sufficiently convinc'd me, that it was in vain for me to expect to be treated *more courteously* for being *anonymous*; since he could not surely have treated the vilest character with more *dedignation* or *contempt*. — However, to remove from him *all offence*, from such *concealment*, I have to this *Vindication* prefixed my name.

Again, he chargeth me with *diffimulation* or *hypocrisy*, p. 9. — with an *impatience of contradiction*, and an *inclination to strife and contention*, p. 7. — And throughout his defence, he imputes to me a *proud, uncharitable spirit*, fill'd with the most *sovereign contempt* of the whole body of *adult-baptizers*.

This is a very *injurious* representation of me; for I am conscious never to have intended to throw the *least contempt* on the *body* of them; no, nor upon any *one individual* of that body,

on

on account of his *differing* sentiments. — Notwithstanding this, Mr. B. will have it, that I have “ *taken occasion to fall foul on his character,* “ *and endeavoured to bring all his brethren into* “ *contempt (b).*”

In denial of the truth of this *accusation*, I refer the *public* to their own examination of the *appendix* to Mr. B's *defence*, and this *vindication*; not doubting, but that the *impartial* will conclude, that Mr. B. has verified an old proverb, *viz. That it is much more safe for some men to steal sheep, than for others to look over the fence.*

He has indeed shewn me the *way of falling foul on character*; — but, I hope, I shall keep clear of an *imitation*; if there be any distinction to be made between *just satire*, and *scurrility* or *defamation*.

And yet, I acknowledge, I have express'd *contempt* towards the BIGOTRY of the *party*; and I think I have a right so to do; as when I say, “ That tho' it must be own'd, that *truth* “ does not always side with numbers, or take “ up her dwelling with the majority; yet it “ seems somewhat wonderful, that she should “ only have so *small an handful of advocates* “ among the many parties and sects that make “ up the christian world. Nor only so, but it is “ amazing that this *particular feature* of hers “ should differ so widely in its effects upon its “ admirers, even as to produce an *unballowed*, an “ *uncharitable* zeal in every individual, in proportion to the attachment he has for it (c).”

(b) *Def.* p. 4.(c) *Append.* p. 2.

Do I direct a *sovereign contempt*, in this passage, at the *number*, or at the *bigotry* of the party?—I am content to refer myself to any unprejudic'd reader, of common understanding.

But the *party* is chargeable with *bigotry*, in the point of baptism; inasmuch as they look upon their *mode* of it, applied only to *adult-subjects*, as necessary to determine any to be of the *visible church of Christ*, which is the manifest design of Mr. B's *two discourses*, and of his defence; in which he expressly says, that such an application of baptism, is "that very way which Christ has thought fit to appoint, in which men ought to make profession of the christian religion (d)." — So that all other baptism is *invalid*; and none are properly christians, but the *adult-baptized*. — This I take to be manifest *bigotry*; and as such, the proper subject of *contempt* and *ridicule*.

Mr. B. I am persuaded, would himself express a like *sovereign contempt* upon a *papist's* claiming the character of a *true catholic*! — or upon his defending the literal sense of, *this is my body*, in order to prove *transubstantiation*: — or, upon a STEBBING's declaring, *that a man might be treated as an HERETICK by the church, who was nothing like it in the eye of God*. — Or, upon *articles of faith* being made the terms of christian communion, concerning which, men cannot possibly have any *clear, distinct, or determinate* ideas. I dare say Mr. B. would think these things proper subjects of *ridicule* and *con-*

(d) *Def.* p. 60. and *two discourses* throughout.

tempt.

tempt. — And why then should not the *bigotry* of the *anabaptists* be treated in like manner? they actually lay so great a stress upon *their way* of baptizing, as to deny *church-fellowship*, or a *communion* with them at the *Lord's table*, to all such who are not *thus* baptized. This is true of the *body* of them. Nay, they can admit a *paedobaptist minister* to preach to them, and offer up their prayers and praises to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, even in the service *immediately preceding* their celebration of the supper, and yet he must not partake with them of that *thanksgiving rite*. — If this be not *bigotry*, I know of none in the world. Here is “ a disproportionate concern to the weight of the matter, and to the prejudice of a more important truth.” Forasmuch as *baptism*, in their particular way, is made *more necessary* to church communion, than to the final happiness of men. For such *paedobaptists* can be allowed by them to be *beirs* of God, and *joint beirs* with Christ, but yet, not *fit* to partake with them of that ONE BREAD, of which all Christ's disciples are commanded to partake.

I persist therefore in saying, that the advocates for truth, are *but a very small handful*, and the visible church of Christ is almost invisible, *i. e.* if none but adult-plunging-baptizers, are *truth's* sincere advocates; and if their practice is of so much importance, as Mr. B. contends for, in his *two discourses* and *defence*. For men, according to him, are not the *visible members* of Christ's church, who have not made an *open profession* of

their *own* faith and repentance, by adult-plunging-baptism. This is the drift of his *whole reasoning*, or, to me, he is unintelligible.

Every *impartial* reader of my *defence* of infant-baptism will plainly see, that that *sovereign contempt* which, Mr. B. says I shew to the *anabaptists*, has the *bigotry* of the party, and not their persons (on account of baptizing) as the *subject* of it. — For I have no where call'd in question the *integrity* of the adult-baptizer, — I have no where made their practice a *disqualification* for church communion, — neither have I laid such a stress upon *any mode* of baptism, as to *contract* the compass of Christ's visible church; nor so as to exclude men from any of the privileges and benefits of the gospel salvation. But,

The charge I have brought against the *anabaptists* (e) has too much occasion given for it, even with regard to that *unseemly degree of warmth* expressed by them, when debating the point of baptism. I have been an *eye and ear witness*, among many others, of something like a *feverish heat* in the spirit of a very publick performance, tho' delivered by a *gentleman* of a very publick character. — And I have been informed by very worthy men, from their own personal knowledge, that some of the most shining characters that have lately been among the *anabaptists* for *learning*, and for *temper and moderation*, in all other respects, and who would have been ornaments to any denomination

(e) N. B. I use not the term by way of reproach; but because, in my opinion, they practise *re-baptizing*.

of christians, have not been able to preserve their moderation, when debating on the subject of *baptism*.

Even their great advocate Dr. GALE, has not been free from this *censorious, uncharitable* temper; as appears by *his reflections on Mr. Wall's history*, &c. For in p. 187, he says, " That *John* baptized by dipping, is as *plain*, as a " thing can well be; and were it not for the " *DARING TEMPER* of *some men*, it would " be trifling, in such an *excess of light*, to attempt to prove it." Can any thing be more insulting? Is not this, to charge men with *impudence*? Whence had he this *excess of light*, that shews mens tempers to be *daring*, who attempt to prove that *John* did not baptize by dipping? There is nothing in the *text*, nothing in the *history* of the *sacramental use* of water among the *Jews*, to prove he did; their *priests* always used the *water of separation* by *sprinkling* (f). There is therefore no such *mighty stretch*, to give *John's* baptizing another turn to that of *dipping*; as he asserts there must. (g)

Nor is that *writer* only guilty of a *singly inadvertent* charge of mens wanting *integrity* of mind, who differ from him in the affair of baptism; but having said, without any sufficient warrant, that *μαθηται* rendered *disciples*, *Acts* xv. 10. " intends only the converts, *exclusively* " of their infants, if they had any." He then says, " This, you see, Sir, is so very clear, that " nothing but *PREPOSSESSION* could incline

(f) See the *Challenge*.

(g) *Reflections*, p. 187.

" any

“ any man to assert, it was infants especially
 “ on whom this yoke was attempted to be
 “ put. (b)”

What *excess of light* he had here, I cannot see. The *prepossession* which he mentions, seems to have had *sufficient ground in fact* to support it; since that yoke refer'd to, viz. that of *circumcision*, had been ever applied to *infants*, and but *rarely* to any else but infants, during the *Jewish* state: But with what face the JUDAIZERS would have put this yoke upon the *disciples*, without intending to put it upon the infants of those *new converts*, I cannot possibly discern. Therefore *infants* must surely be intended to be included under the name *disciple*, in this place: And the *prepossession* is unavoidable. So that to talk of the etymology of the word, as he does, is of little avail in this place, when it was highly improbable that *infants* should be here excluded the idea annexed to the term *disciples*, but must be intended according to the ancient custom or usage.

But Dr. Gale is yet more free with the *moral characters* of those who differ from him; “ for,
 “ says he, ask a *countryman* what he means by
 “ the word *scholar*, he will tell you, he means
 “ one that goes to school to learn. — And
 “ what by *disciple*? — One that holds such a
 “ man's opinions, and thinks his way best. And
 “ you will find the *country-man* understands
 “ his mother-tongue *better* than some others
 “ seem to do; and if he uses *more honest simpli-*

(b) *Reflections*, p. 296.

“ *city*,

"city, he uses *more reason too* in explaining his meaning, than the **BIASS OF INTEREST AND PARTIES** will suffer some men of letters to do. (i)"

What can be a more insolent charge upon the *paedobaptists* than this? The *bias of interest and parties*! — Is this *Catholicism*? And yet this came from the pen of one of the *first character* among the *antipaedobaptists*, both for temper and learning.

So that the *stigma of bigotry* is but too justly fixed on the *party*; since none are allowed to be men of *integrity*, none free from the *biass of interest and parties* but themselves; nay, none *reason or conclude* with the *common sense* of a *rustic*, in the affair of baptism, but themselves. — Compare these passages of Dr. Gale, with that cited in my title page, from his *Reflections*, p. 6.

And if I do not egregiously mistake, Mr. B's defence has something very *feverish* in it, if it is not *full of bigotry*.

He has indeed express'd his *indignation* under a colour of just resentment for my contempt of him and of his brethren; and for the injuries I had offer'd to his *two discourses*; but that this was no more than a *colour*, what I have already offer'd, with the following part of the *vindication*, I hope will sufficiently evince.

I would here take notice of Mr. B's mentioning "the *poor, despised anabaptists*, and his intimating the *great contempt and hardships* to

(i) *Reflections*, p. 296, 297.

" which

“ which they, of all men, are most expos'd.
 “ Their being *content* to forego some advantages,
 “ which they might enjoy, if they could *think*
 “ and *practise* as their neighbours do; and their
 “ bearing reproach plentifully cast upon them
 “ for venturing to *differ*. (k)”

This sort of representation, I have heard at their publick baptisms, when the exhortations to *courage* and *resolution* has been given, and their submission to *plunging baptism* applauded, as an instance of very *peculiar regard* to the institution of Jesus.

But I would ask, are the *anabaptists* more exposed to *contempt*, *neglect* or *ill-usage* from men, on account of *their way* of baptizing, than others who *dissent* from the established forms of worship. — As to the *meekness* of their spirits, and their *patience* under contradiction, and their *bearing reproach* with a christian spirit, if Mr. B's *defence* may stand as a *sample* of it, they have little room of boasting. — Who he designs to reflect upon as *their neighbours*, that enjoy advantages which they themselves are obliged to forego, from the *greater tenderness* of their consciences, is not my business to take notice of; I know of no advantages I enjoy in the community above them.

Neither can I discern the reason of the *declaration*, *poor and despis'd anabaptists*! They live, for any thing I know, as much *unvillified*, and enjoy as much *liberty* and *freedom* as their neighbours. — It is therefore a poor insinuation,

(k) *Defence*, p. 65, comp. p. 7.

that the *anabaptists* are *despised* on account of their venturing to differ. But — If Mr. B's complaint is for want of a *civil establishment* of his practice, I see no remedy but *patience*. — And as to the *courage* requisite to the making, what Mr. B. calls, an *open profession* by baptism, it does not appear to demand *more courage* than to the making an *open profession* over the *memorial rite*. Unless they mean, that such extraordinary courage is needful to go into the *cold water*, in *cold weather*. And as to this, I doubt not. but many are obliged to summon up all their resolution to comply with it. And yet, there may perhaps be some reason assigned for it *among themselves*; inasmuch, as *great numbers* of these christian people remain *unbaptized*. So that, *resolution* may be needful for quitting the *rank* and *station* of those *invisible members* of Christ's church. — I hope I do not misrepresent them, since Mr. B. “thinks it consistent with *great catholicism* to deny that any others are *visible members* of the christian church, than those who make *profession of their own faith*. (1)” Which in his *two discourses* he has asserted, *must be done by baptism*. It must, of consequence, be for want of countenance from numbers of their own people, that so much *courage* is wanting; and not to the *contempt* or *reproach* of others.

To talk therefore of the *poor* and *despised*, at this time of the day, would *much better* become the mouth of an *enthusiast*, whose chief business is to work upon the passions of the *weak*, than

(1) *Def.* p. 48, 49.

it can become the pen of an *anabaptist*, who thinks religion to be a *reasonable service*.

But yet, if the *anabaptists* do give just ground of *ridicule* from their *manner* of baptizing, they may thank themselves for it. And it is incumbent on them to shew, that plunging in cold water, with manifest *peril* to some constitutions, has not the air of *fanaticism*. That is to say, in such cases where it could not be justified but upon an expectation of some *extraordinary* interpositions of providence in their favour; which seems to be a subject of ridicule.

Should they urge the *danger* that attended *circumcision*. It would be a sufficient answer, that the *mode* of circumcision admitted of no ambiguity in the command that enjoined it; whereas the word *βαπτίζω*, cannot be confin'd in its sense to *plunging*, but as properly signifies a *partial* application of water.

But it seems I had said, " I cannot but think
" that the serious *paedobaptist* stands as much exposed to the *scoff* and *sneer* of men; for it is
" almost enough to give any thing a good grace,
" that it has any *oddness* or *peculiarity* in it (m)."

Mr. B. says, " which *oddness* and *peculiarity*
" are the very things I had in some parts of
" my *appendix* made the foundations of the *con-*
" *tempt* cast by me upon their whole body (n)."

I am conscious of no such thing in the *appendix*, as my making the *oddness* and *peculiarity* of their mode of baptism the foundation of my casting contempt on their body. — Tho' I yet

(m) *Append.* p. 40.

(n) *Def.* p. 65.

say, that was *plunging-baptism* to be regarded and complied with, *only* on account of its *peculiarity*, *singularity* or *oddness*, it would be very agreeable to the taste of the present age.

Nevertheless, this I intended not, nor do intend as a reflexion on the *mode of baptism*, in order to throw contempt on the *whole body* of *adult-baptizers*; but to shew, that they are in no more danger of reproach for their practice, than *infant-baptizers* are for theirs.

Mr. B. farther says, " That my works shew me to be inclin'd to *strife* and *contention* (o)." And he also has intimated what some of my works are; for he says, " *that I have attempted some defences of the christian revelation* (p)."

If Mr. B. does me justice, all my friends are either *prejudic'd*, or *weak*, or *unfaithful* to me; for none of them have ever yet reprov'd me for discovering an inclination to *strife* and *contention*. — But, Mr. B. I presume has done me injury, by representing my *abhorrence of bigotry*, to be a *sovereign contempt of persons*! He has not distinguish'd between the enmity I have to *narrow*, *imposing*, *uncharitable* sentiments; and a delight in *reproach*, *scorn* and *contempt* of men, which is inconsistent with such enmity.

I shall proceed to vindicate my remarks made in the *appendix* upon Mr. B's *two discourses*; and defend my argument for *infant-baptism* against his *defence*.

(o) *Def.* p. 7.

(p) p. 15. Note.



S E C T. I.

Of positive institutions. More particularly, of water-baptism among christians, its origine, design and use.— In the place of circumcision. Righteousness fulfilled in the baptizing of infants, equally with that fulfilled in the baptism of adult persons.



Water-baptism I have all along represented as a *Jewish rite*, which *Jesus* adopted, and has appointed the use of, in order, to *initiate* into his church or kingdom; or to *distinguish* men and their families from those who embrace not the christian doctrine. At the *first* preaching of the gospel, men, who embraced it, were *immediately initiated*, together with households, by baptism; and as this was the manifest intention of the *rite* in the apostolic age, it cannot signify *more* in any after-age. And,

All must allow, that the *importance* of any *rite*, is to be estimated from its *use* and *intention*; for even *principles* and *sentiments*, tho' supported on *truth*, cannot, by a just estimation, have their importance carried farther than their *aptitude*, *influence*, or *tendency* to promote moral rectitude. — But, as *baptism*

tism has not any virtue or influence, in a moral sense, to *purify*, or to *save*; but can only *mark out*, or *separate* a person, or *initiate* into a constitution of grace and life, it can be no more than a *positive rite*, tho' *Jesus* should appoint, and an *apostle* administer it. — For baptism no more *secures* the virtue and happiness of a grown person, than of an infant.

Besides, a due attention to the *end* and *design* of baptism, must be of importance in settling the controversy about it. It should seem to be only a *rite of separation*. Thus *John* understood it, when he compared his baptizing with water, to our *Lord's* baptizing with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. The former baptism of our *Lord's*, separated the apostles to the important work of publishing the gospel; the latter shall *separate* the chaff from the wheat; or the wicked from the righteous. — So *St. Paul* understood baptism, when applied to the *Israelites* being separated from their former *task-masters* the *Egyptians* unto *Moses*. — And so the baptism of men and their households did and does *separate* from the infidel world, as the *peculium* of God under *Jesus*.

This *postulate* will shew, that the *quantity* of water is not essential to the idea of baptism; the *end* of baptism being answered as well by the *sprinkling* of water, as by *perfusion*, or by *plunging*.

And will also shew, that a *separation* may as well be made of *infants*, as of *grown persons*; unless there be any *express prohibition* of its being so applied.

Upon which principles I shall build the following *vindication*: being persuaded, that there is no *such prohibition*; but many arguments to be offer'd in favour of such a view of water-baptism; *especially*, as it answers to the *design* and *end* of *Christ's* coming, which was to *redeem* or *separate* men to himself, and to take *theirs* under his *special care* and *protection*.

Mr. B. is indeed angry with me, as having misrepresented him, *he says*, in the affair of *positive rites*;

rites; and chargeth me “ with surmising, without any occasion, that he intended to express a false way of reasoning upon the point of ritual institutions. (a)” Nay, *he says*, “ I begin with a downright false quotation, and wrong him by citing a part of his sentence, and leaving the rest unquoted. (b)”

The truth of the case is this; I have said, “ That in order to deter and dissuade from a neglect and contempt of *positive commands*, from *plausible arguments*, this is given as an example, *viz. That the absolute necessity of the one, and the manifest inferiority and subserviency of the other*, is manifest unrighteousness and injustice towards God. (c)”

This I quoted from Mr. B's *two discourses*, p. 7. in which he asserts, “ That if we pretend to chuse for our selves, and to stick to moral righteousness, in the neglect and contempt of positive commands, such a neglect and contempt as this, such a chusing and refusing at our own will and pleasure, let us support it in our own minds by ever so *plausible reasons*; as for *EXAMPLE, the absolute necessity of the one, and the manifest inferiority and subserviency of the other*, is manifest unrighteousness and injustice towards God.”

Let it be observ'd, I have only quoted the *example*, as an *example*; which he had produced to *illustrate* his argument by: And I have made the citation *full* and *exact*. — If therefore the *example* does not suit his reasoning, or does not afford an instance that will *illustrate* his argument, is it my fault? Am I hence liable to censure? It is unfair treatment, since I observed, that Mr. B. has denied that it can be a *proper example*. For he says, “ *it is a downright absurdity and contradiction in its own nature to reject positive institutions on the account of their being*

(a) *Def.* p. 12.

(b) p. 9.

(c) *Append.* p. 3.

“ only subservient to moral purposes ; for if they are
 “ at all subservient, that is a good reason why we should
 “ obey them. (d)” — Upon which I remarked,
 “ That this, no doubt, is a just way of treating
 “ positive institutions ; but then, how this should ever
 “ be esteemed a plausible reason for neglecting them,
 “ when it is a downright absurdity and contradiction in
 “ its own nature to reject them on account of their
 “ being only subservient to moral purposes, seems diffi-
 “ cult to make appear. (e)”

Again, Mr. B. says, “ That I have represented
 “ him as affirming the plausible reason, which he
 “ mentions as an example, to be the unrighteousness
 “ and injustice : — that I cite a parenthesis out of his
 “ sentence, and tell my readers, that he calls the
 “ things mentioned in the parenthesis, unrighteousness
 “ and injustice towards God ; and for this refers to ap-
 “ pend. p. 3. (f)”

The foundation of this I find not, — and refer
 with freedom to the same *append. p. 3.* This ex-
 ample, I observ’d, can only be defended, from
 mens making it a reason of their wilful neglect of
 the positive institution, as he would insinuate ; —
 but not being able to see how it can be made a rea-
 son of such neglect, I add, “ if it should be under-
 “ stood as expressing false ideas of the distinction
 “ between positive commands and moral righteousness,
 “ the example is then itself a false example and
 “ delusive. (g)”

Every one may see, who reads the *appendix*, that
 I had no intention to weaken those arguments which
 do properly recommend obligation to positive com-
 mands ; but only to preserve that distinction which is,
 in the nature of things and in all revelation, made
 between moral and positive commands ; from p. 3. to
 p. 9. — And in p. 41. I have own’d, “ that

(d) *Two Disc.* p. 10.

(f) *Def.* p. 10.

(e) *Append.* p. 40.

(g) *Append.* p. 3.

“ with

“ with regard to *external testimony*, positive institutions stand upon the same foot as the *doctrines* do to which they refer ; for he who said, *I am the resurrection and the life* ; said also, *this do in remembrance of me.*”

But altho’ the *authority* of Jesus with respect to *positive institutions* is unquestionably binding, so far as men can discern the *intention* or *design* of them ; yet surely we cannot with *truth* say, that the authority of Jesus in these *inferior* things, is of equal *importance* to his authority in those *greater* things to which these inferior things are *manifestly subservient*. And because that *positive rites* (such as *baptism* and the *supper*) are *manifestly inferior* to *moral righteousness*, hence we conclude it is that they are not universally discerned with the same *perspicuity* and *clearness*, even by some pious and sincere christians ; and consequently, their influence is not so *uniform* upon honest minds as is the importance of *things* of moral, immutable, eternal obligation.

Nevertheless, there certainly is a *decency*, a *decorum* (*b*), a *becomingness* in observing the positive institutions of Jesus, in all such who perceive the *reason* of them, or discern the *compass* of their obligation.

Mr. B. seems indeed, to me, to have carried their importance much *too high* ; which must *offend*, rather than *conciliate* the mind of an infidel. For he says, “ If there be a good proof of a divine institution, good proof that God requires us to use a certain *rite* or *ceremony*, tho’ in our eyes ever so mean, and tho’ we ourselves are not let into the design of it ; yet to refuse compliance in such a case, is downright disobedience, and a violation of God’s authority ; which is as certainly immorality, tho’ of a *different kind*, as the breaking what we usually call a *moral precept*. For tho’ we can abstractedly conceive of things as being good

(*b*) *ορεπρον εστιν. Matth. iii. 15.*

“ and right, without immediate regard to any signification of God’s will concerning them ; yet
 “ there is in reality nothing fit or just for us to do,
 “ but what becomes so by means of God’s disposing
 “ things in that order, from which the several relations and obligations in life arise.(i)” And he says,
 “ in positive institutions, the *mere will* of the law-giver, considering who the law-giver is, is a *sufficient reason* for the subject’s obedience. (k)”

I am not sure that mankind has ever been obliged, by any positive institution, from the *mere will* of the law-giver. For they all seem to have had respect to such a disposition of things, from which their relation and obligation has arisen ; and therefore the *mere will* of the law-giver has not been the *sole* reason for the subject’s obedience.

For, as to the *reason* of the rite of circumcision, Dr. Patrick thus expresses himself ; he says, “ The
 “ most plain and obvious reason is, that it might
 “ be an apt token of the divine covenant made
 “ with *Abraham* and his posterity : that God would
 “ multiply their seed, and make them as the stars
 “ of heaven, *Gen. xv. 5.* It is probable also, that
 “ this part was chosen rather than any other to
 “ make them sensible that this was a divine sacrament. For nothing but God’s institution
 “ could at first engage men to lay that part bare
 “ which nature hath covered. (l)”

I would beg leave to add, that it seem’d to intimate the obligation they should be under of guarding against the excesses of *bodily impurity*, which greatly prevailed in *Abraham’s* day among the nations. This is evident from the repeated danger *Sarah* had been in of having her chastity violated. See *Gen. xii. 15. xx. 2.*

(i) *Two disc.* p. 19.

(k) *Ibid.*

(l) *Comment. on Gen.* p. 290.

Besides,

Besides, the *want of chastity* had occasioned that swell of impiety which brought on the deluge, or the destruction of the old world. See *Gen.* vi. 4, 5, 6.

There was therefore a manifest reason or fitness, for this positive rite being made the token of God's covenant with *Abraham*.

That the *rite* was not applied till the *eighth day*, the above *writer* has assigned this reason, *viz.* "because till then they were look'd upon as imperfect, as not yet sufficiently cleansed and purged; for which reason beasts (we find afterwards) were not accepted by God till seven days were passed after their birth, *Exod.* xxii. 30.(m)"

The *rite of circumcision* stands thus, *Gen.* xvii. 8. God had promised the land of *Canaan* to *Abraham* and to his *seed* after him, for an everlasting possession; which covenant, says God, *Ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised*, v. 10. Hence the reason, design, or intention of the *rite* was evident, *viz.* the keeping them a *distinct* people to whom the promise was made. So that as this was the *tenure* of their possession, it was, at the same time, a *reconciling reason* to their submitting to the rite. Now had this been the whole compass of the *Abrahamic* covenant, or the whole intention of the rite; at the time of their becoming *possessors* of the promised land, one would have thought the *reason* of the rite had been vacated. But this was not the case; the *Abrahamic* covenant intended *more*; for God had promised that *Abraham* should be the *father of many nations*, v. 5. which promise is made *more explicite*, ch. xxii. 18. *viz.* that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. And hence the *reason* of the rite continued till the coming of the *Messiah*.

(m) Comment. on *Gen.* p. 293.

The *descendants* of *Abraham* might therefore see a *reason* for their compliance with the *positive rite*, as it was the *seal* of the *Abrahamic covenant* in which they gloried.

Thus in the *passover*, another rite enjoined their observance thro' all their generations; they had the *reason* assigned, *viz.* God's wonderful appearance in favour of Israel, in that dreadful night, when his angel destroy'd all the *FIRST BORN* of Egypt. It was but fit that some memorial of such an interposal of divine tenderness, in passing over the houses of the Israelites, should be instituted.

In like manner, if we turn to the christian rites of *baptism* and the *supper*, we see a *reason*, a *suitableness* in the one and in the other, *e. g.*

In *baptism*; — forasmuch as the *Abrahamic covenant* had had its accomplishment, in the coming of the *promised seed*, who was to *bless all nations*; and the *seal* of the *old covenant* was now cancelled, it having done its office in preserving one people and family distinct: — It was therefore *proper*, *highly fit* that a rite should take place, that should every where intimate, that the old rite was *cancel'd*; and that no *distinction* any more remain'd of *sect* or of *nation*, in the view of the *new covenant*. — And the application of *baptismal water* to men who embraced christianity and to their offspring, did, and does every where signify, the *unlimited extent* of that favour and protection which the gospel covenant would exhibit — But as *faith* in *Abraham*, was *previously* requisite to his having the *seal* of the *covenant of peculiarity* applied to him and to his seed, as well as in every *profelyte* to the *Jewish* religion, before he and his children were admitted to have the *seal*; so *faith* in the gospel, and *repentance* towards God was *previously* requisite in such persons who embraced christianity, to their having the *gospel seal* applied to them and to their offspring, or households

households; which *pre-requisites* do continue in every age.

Notwithstanding this, since the *history* of these *positive rites*, [used, either under the *covenant of peculiarity*, or under the *gospel covenant*] gives us no reason to imagine, that the subjects of either covenant, were to have a *change* in the manner of applying the *seals*: But as *Abraham's faith* entitled him and his *infant descendants* to the seal of circumcision; so the *faith* of converted *Jews* and *Gentiles* entitled them and their families or descendants to the seal of baptism; it follows, that to insist upon the *posterity* of converted christians being educated in the same *faith* with their parents, *before* they receive the seal of baptism, does appear to be an *innovation* upon the *order* or *oeconomy* of *positive, initial rites*. — Nor is there any thing more evident in the *gospel history*, than a *correspondency* in these initial rites, as to the *subjects* of them. For, as *Abraham's faith* entitled his whole household, and all his male descendants to the *same rite* that was applied to himself, so upon the *faith* of the convert to christianity, his whole household, or her whole household were entitled to the *same seal*; and had it actually applied.

Nor could the *Jews* mistake in this article, since they always were address'd unto, under this encouraging view of the *gospel covenant*, *viz. that it included ALL THEIRS with them.*

So our Lord speaks to *Zaccheus*, *Luke xix. 9.* — *This day is salvation come to THIS HOUSE.* — *The promise is to you and to YOUR CHILDREN.* *St. Peter, Acts ii. 39.* — *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and THINE HOUSE, Acts xvi. 31.* — So *Cornelius* was bid to send for *Peter*, who should tell him words *whereby he and ALL HIS HOUSE should be saved, Acts xi. 14.* — So *Crispus* is said to believe on the Lord *with all his house*; and many *Corinthians*, doubtless, with their houses, if heads of families, were

were baptized, *Acts* xviii. 8. So Stephenas with his household were baptized, *1 Cor.* i. 16. — Also Lydia and her household, *Acts* xvi. 15. — Instances sufficient to shew, that the seal or token of the new covenant had a correspondency to that of the *Abrahamic seal*; inasmuch, as if a man believed, his whole house were esteemed holy, and admitted to the benefits of the gospel covenant; and consequently, to the *baptismal seal* or token. If a man believed, he should be saved and HIS HOUSE.

And as the rite of *circumcision* was to distinguish a family and people till the promise was accomplished, and then become null, so the rite of *baptism*, which succeeds it, should be perpetuated; as it is a symbol of the undistinguishing grace and favour of the christian covenant, and intimates, the *extension* of it to Jews and Gentiles, among all nations, and all ages. Besides, it should be continued as expressive of the purity of the christian constitution, and may well fill up the interval between our Lord's baptizing with the Holy Ghost, and his baptizing with fire, viz. At that period, when he will come with his fan in his hand, and will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the wheat into his garner, but burn the chaff with fire unquenchable, *Matth.* iii. 11, 12.

Nevertheless, I have observed, that Mr. B. carries his notions of positive institutions too high; notwithstanding in his defence, p. 17. he says, "by considering who this law-giver is, he plainly shews his belief, that he never appoints any one ritual institution for the sake of mere will and pleasure, but for wise, and gracious and useful purposes, tho' it may not be always expedient for us to be told what those purposes are." — As he instances in the *Mosaic* oeconomy itself, — and says, "He does not believe that there was one ritual institution enjoyed for mere will and pleasure, in the mind

" of

“ of the law-giver himself, — tho’ it was not need-
 “ ful, nor perhaps fitting, that they should then be
 “ acquainted with all those purposes. As to great
 “ numbers of those institutions, it has been abun-
 “ dantly proved by judicious authors, that they
 “ were wisely calculated to serve good purposes :
 “ And if we were thoroughly acquainted with all the
 “ circumstances of the people to whom they were en-
 “ joined, and all the dispositions and customs of their
 “ heathen neighbours, and all the views of the
 “ divine mind to future times, I make no doubt
 “ (says he) but we should see wise and good reasons
 “ for every particular institution. But God, it
 “ seems, tho’ he knew sufficient reasons for every
 “ institution, did not think proper to acquaint the
 “ people with them.”

Upon this, “ he would ask the gentleman who
 “ is so fearful of shewing *too much* regard to the will
 “ of the law-giver,” several questions. — “ As
 “ whether the *Jews* were obliged in conscience to
 “ obey the institutions given them? Whether there
 “ was a reason sufficient to demand their obedi-
 “ ence? or might they refuse because the particular
 “ intentions were not published? — And whether
 “ any man under the gospel could be excused from
 “ submitting to the ordinances of baptism and the
 “ Lord’s supper, even in case, he knew nothing
 “ more relating to them, than the command of
 “ Christ, and the proof of his having authority
 “ from God to demand obedience from the subjects
 “ of his kingdom.”

Mr. B. farther says, “ he should have no great
 “ opinion of a man’s fidelity, let him talk ever so
 “ loudly of moral obligation, (n)” *i. e.* if he would
 “ not even in such case submit to the institutions.

This, I apprehend is no more than the putting a
string of questions, upon mere hypothesis. For altho’ I
 doubt not, but there was a *reason* for every one of

the *Jewish injunctions*, and do think that learned men have well accounted for numbers of them; yet I am not sure, that that people were not better acquainted with their *own circumstances*, and with the *dispositions* and *customs* of their heathen neighbours, than even those *learned men*, who, at this distance, have rationally accounted for many of their institutions; and therefore, I am not sure, that God did not think proper to acquaint that people with the reason of them. I am, on the contrary, of opinion, that they did discern *some reason* of every injunction, besides the *will and pleasure of the law-giver*.

In the two institutions of the *circumcision* and the *passover*, the *design or reason* was obvious; but if any *ceremonial* was enjoined without farther reasons than *mere will and pleasure*, it does not suit the case before us. — And as to the *gospel dispensation*, I think myself clear in the point, that no one thing is enjoined the christian from the *mere pleasure* of the law-giver. Nor do I know how we should be able to prove that Christ had authority from God to demand our obedience to *such things* which had nothing more than *mere pleasure* to support the demand.

A *writer*, who seems to understand well the *temper of Jesus*, has observed, “ That positive appointments are of a quite different nature from *arbitrary* impositions; with which they are too often confounded. The idea of *arbitrary* (he thinks) implies a *weakness* incompatible to the divine nature, whose perfection it is to do nothing but for some *wise reason* and for some *good end*. Nor can such a blemish ever cleave to the government, any more than to the nature of God, as an *arbitrary* act; that is, an act of the divine will without a *wise reason*, and for no good end. (c)”

(c) Dr. Grosvenor's *moral obligation to positive appointments*, p. 23.

Command-

Commandments may indeed have been given, in extraordinary cases, to try the faith of particular persons, where the *reason* or *end* has not been obvious when given; as in the case of *Abraham's* offering up his son *Isaac*. Or, a submission may have been demanded to a *transient* rite, such as that *baptismal* one, mentioned, *John xiii. begin.* — But then, in the former case, *Abraham* was not suffered to carry his obedience into *full execution*, but learn'd the *end* of the trial without it. — And in the other, our Lord did not demand submission from *mere authority*, but assured *Peter*, that what he did to him then, he should know, which he explained immediately after the washing was over; and the rite was not applied by *Peter* who was ignorant of its intention, at the time of its application, but by *Jesus*, who well knew the intention of it.

N.B. It might here be ask'd, What *righteousness* was fulfilled by the disciples *consent* to this rite, when they were ignorant of the design of it, that may not be fulfilled by baptism upon infants?

Yet, these *instances* will not support the argument for an *implicite observance* of positive rites, where *mere pleasure* only makes the demand. For,

Our blessed Lord always addresseth to men, as *reasonable* beings; and demands no *credit*, no *obedience* but what is worthy *reasonable* nature. He ever took the utmost pains to convince his audience, *that he only wanted men to reason and reflect*, — to use their powers, and to be determined by the weight of evidence. — Hence, I cannot think that he ever intended that *mere authority* should be sufficient to command our obedience.

And yet, the *authority* of *Jesus*, will, doubtless, give great weight even to a *moral precept*. — But I SAY unto you, *love your enemies.* — A new commandment I GIVE unto you, *that ye love one another.* And this authority will enforce a *positive institution*, such as
 E that

that of *baptism* or the *supper*. — But not this, unless there appear some *suitableness* in the rite, to answer some *known end* worthy of the institution.

And thus in the *initial rite*, grown persons discern *baptism* to be expressive of their *separation* to God in Jesus, and of their obligation to personal purity. — And they likewise discern, that it can be applied to their *offspring* without *distinction of sex*, which circumcision could not be. — And as to the *supper*, every one may see, that it has a *more extensive* blessing to commemorate, than that which the *passover* had.

Upon the whole, I must own, that I can have a good opinion of a man's *fidelity*, tho' he should object to a *positive rite*, for which he can see no reason, but *mere will and pleasure*. And herein I differ from Mr. B.

But Mr. B. seems to say, that *positive institutions* oblige as much from *mere pleasure*, as if the reason of them was discerned. His words are these, “ In-
“ deed he (*i. e.* God or Christ) is pleased, under
“ the dispensation of the gospel, to let us know
“ the *gracious* and *useful purposes* proposed by him
“ in the institutions enjoined to us. But this AL-
“ TERS NOTHING in the nature of the obligati-
“ on. (p)”

Here, I am of opinion, Mr. B. has fully explained himself; and shewn the *undue stress* which he lays upon *mere authority*. — And by it, no doubt, he greatly obscures the light which we have into the *nature of obligation*. For surely, to know the *gracious* and *useful purposes* of an institution, must make *great alteration* in the nature of the obligation, to what it would be, if *mere will and pleasure* gave us the whole condition or state of it. So that, Mr. B. would make *positive commands* to have as much weight as *rational and moral obligation*; nay, if I mistake not,

(b) Def. p. 17. beg.

he

he has set *mere will* ABOVE the rank of *moral obligation*; since a knowledge of the *gracious* and *useful purposes* which there are in a positive injunction, *alters nothing in the nature of the obligation*. But had he attended to the reasoning of Dr. Grosvenor in the tract before refer'd to; he would have found a manifest distinction justly made, even between positive commands whose *fitness* is *discernable*, and moral obligation. Forasmuch as, the Dr. says, "Some things are *absolutely* necessary to salvation, and in their own nature, without which there can be no salvation at all. — But no *merely positive* appointments are necessary in this sense, (*i. e.*) *absolutely* and in their own nature. — And yet, a disposition to obey divine orders, wherever they are discerned, either *positive* or *moral*, is part of that holiness *without which no man shall see the Lord*. — A *sacrament* is a positive rite, and not to be compared with moral virtue, but a disposition to obey God's order, is moral virtue. (*q*)"

Mr. B. is greatly offended with me for charging the anabaptists with *calling in question* the *capacity*, or *integrity* of all that declare for infant-baptism. That if I designed this reflection against him alone, I did very wrong. For he has done no otherwise than given the reasons why he differs from his brethren. (*r*)"

I have already hinted at the manner of his reasoning or defending his practice, as *censorious* and *uncharitable*. And I yet insist upon it that *it is like the reasoning of a protestant* to reflect upon him and the generality of the defenders of adult-plunging-baptism, as having called in question both the *integrity* and *capacity* of *infant-baptizers*; Mr. B's two discourses are not to me intelligible, if they do not charge men with being either *weak* in their *intellectuals*, or

(*q*) See his *moral obligation*, prop. i. ii. iii.

(*r*) *Def.* p. 63, 64.

else dishonest, who see not the reason, or comply not with the practice of *adult-baptizers*. For I ask, in my turn, has he once so much as own'd that there is any christian baptism but what is *adult*, and by plunging? Has he any where own'd, that men may belong to *Christ's visible church* who are not so baptized? In both those discourses and in the defence of them, he asserts the contrary, if he asserts any thing, "That according to the tenour of the
 " new testament (the profession which should give
 " a right to baptism) must be a *personal* profession;
 " and that *baptism* was designed to be the token of
 " a *personal, voluntary* submission to Christ. — That
 " to this agrees the PLAINEST SENSE of the com-
 " mission itself; of the EXAMPLE of baptism;
 " and of the REASONINGS upon it. — And that
 " there is NO ROOM for conjectural inferences from
 " the constitution of the *Mosaic law*, or from the
 " *Abrahamic* covenant that went before it. (s)"

Which, if true, both the *integrity* and *capacity* of infant-baptizers stand impeached. And they must
 " answer for themselves (as he says, I must do,) in
 " administering what they call *baptism* to infants,
 " and admitting them as *visible* members of the
 " church. (t)"

I wish Mr. B. had thought how he can answer it, if he should be found to have *narrowed* the church of Christ, without any manifest authority. — The *contracting* scheme is not greatly favoured by the *genius* and *spirit* of christianity. — And for my own part, I declare, that it is matter of grief to me, that any *modes* are made the terms of christian communion; since I am persuaded, there is an unavoidable tendency in their being so to destroy that *charity*, which is the *bond of perfectness*.

(s) Def. p. 47. comp. two disc. p. 42, 43.

(t) Def. p. 49.

Farther, *baptism*, as Mr. B. has placed it, don't seem to have that place which it ought to have in the *economy* of positive rites. The *supper*, in my humble opinion, stands far better in the place, where he puts *baptism*. Forasmuch as men do, *over the memorials of Christ's death*, make a profession of their own *faith* in him, and of their *hopes* and *expectations* from him.

The *Lord's supper* does, in its own nature, appear to be better adapted for the christian's confession of sin, and the thankful profession of his hope of pardon, than baptism: Since the *cup* is the commemorative symbol of *remission of sins* in Christ's blood, shed for many.

Again, altho' baptism should be allowed to be a significant *seal* or *token* of mens being initiated into a dispensation of *pardon* and *life* to persons who have renounced a state of *infidelity* or *vice* antecedent to their baptism, yet, as it is not *repeated*, it can exhibit no profession of repentance, nor any sense of pardon respecting those sins committed after baptism. Whereas the *supper*, in the repeated celebration of it, is suited to excite our penitency, and to renew and confirm our faith and hope in the divine mercy.

So that the children of christian parents baptized in infancy, will have a *proper opportunity* of acknowledging themselves sinners, who stand in need of mercy. Which Mr. B. seems to have made baptism, *adult-baptism* necessary for; since he says, "That we are to shew, that even those who are convinced of the truth and divine authority of the christian religion are not, according to the mind of Christ, required to take on them by baptism the profession of it" [*i.e.* of repentance.] (u)

Should I ask Mr. B. whether the sense of obligation to *repentance* does not operate very early in

(u) *Def.* p. 24.

young minds, who are conscious that they have done amiss? I dare say he would own it does. And perhaps in many *much sooner* than he would chuse to baptise them. — But surely it cannot be the mind of Christ that a profession of repentance should be deferred to baptism at *adult* age: Or have its *emphasis* at the application of that rite; since its obligation is as early as a sense of *guilt* and *demerit* is discerned by the sinner.

To proceed, Mr. B. charges me with a capital crime, “for cramming into five lines of quotation, what he has made the substance of the “greatest part of his *discourse*, and upon which he “has laid the *greatest stress* for finding out the mind “of Christ. (x)”

To make satisfaction for which neglect, I would observe, that as to baptism’s being called the *baptism of repentance*, upon which Mr. B. has dilated from p. 37, — 38: of his two discourses; — I cannot but at present be of opinion, that the term *repentance*, when first applied to baptism, had this idea essential to it, *viz.* *mens change of mind* (y), or their *renouncing* the religions they had before professed, either of *Gentilism* or *Judaism*. — For altho’ *baptism* demanded a *change* of vicious habits in all such who embraced the gospel, to any good purpose; yet, I doubt not but there were *many* baptized with this baptism, who were *habitually pious* and *holy persons*. Among such, I reckon the *guileless Nathanael* to have been one, and the *devout Cornelius* to have been another. And I see no reason to exclude either *Lydia*, or the *Eunuch*, or *Crispus*. — To suppose baptism to have been the *baptism of repentance* to such pious persons, must chiefly intend, their *renouncing Judaism*, or import the *change of their religion*.

(x) Def. p. 50.

(y) μετανοια.

And if we consider it in this light, we shall have a reason assignable for our Lord's submitting to baptism. As he was by it *initiated* into a publick character, introducing a dispensation that was to *abrogate* and *dissolve* the *Jewish* dispensation.

I might take this opportunity to observe the *easy transition* that there was made between the *rite of circumcision* and *baptism*, — between the *passover rite* and the *supper*, — and between the change of the *Jewish sabbath*, to the christians observance of the *first day* of the week, in honour to the resurrection of *Jesus*. — But I only leave the hint to the consideration of my reader.

To proceed, I understand *baptism* as a rite properly applicable to the *infants* of professing christians, tho' they can neither be said to *repent*, as expressing a change of their religion, nor *repent* of any course of action; forasmuch as it does not appear to be the seal of *actual pardon*, in its original intention, even to the *adult person* who embraced christianity; but only a *rite* by which he was *initiated* into a constitution of *grace*, wherein he might be enabled to discern the *doctrine of pardon*, in its strongest light. This seems to have been the *true state* of the case, since numbers were baptized for the *remission of sins*, who were *vicious* persons, and became no true penitents. *Infants* therefore appear to me the proper subjects of this *baptism of repentance*, as they are initiated by it into a constitution of *pardon* and of *life*.

The denial of baptism to *infants* of professing christians, appears to me as having some marks of *cruelty* in it; since infants, as I have elsewhere observed, are certainly subjected to death in consequence of the *one offence*. But as baptism is the *initiating rite* into a constitution which declares *that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive*, this rite applied to infants becomes a proper, significant seal or token of REMISSION, not of *sin* or *personal*

personal demerit, but of death, or of their deliverance from under the dominion of it. So that the application of it, may minister comfort to parents whose offspring die in infancy : And should teach them not to sorrow as those who are without hope. It is not therefore setting a *seal* to a blank : or an *over-officious* way of applying water. — But it is expressive of *truth*, as it asserts the *extent* of the redeemer's care and dominion. — Which the *denial* of this initial rite to infants does not do.

I know that Dr. Gale has said, “ That *paedobaptists* are at a loss to determine, what else but *original sin* infants should be baptized for. — And concludes, that if children are not baptized for actual nor original sin, it necessarily follows, that they are not to be baptized at all. (z)”

But his *premises* and *conclusion* seem to have no good foundation.

And Mr. B. “ would not have me too positive, “ that under the dispensation of the gospel, Christ's ordinance of baptism must needs be administered to the same subjects, as circumcision was in the same covenant made with *Abraham* and under the *Mosaic* law; whether Christ himself thought this proper or not. If Christ had thought it proper, and suited to the dispensation he came to publish; we are satisfied he would have given as plain directions for the baptizing of infants, as we know he has given for the baptizing of grown persons, upon their actual profession of their faith in him. (a)”

Mr. B. has never yet proved, that according to the new testament account of baptism, the children of professing christians were *ever forbid* being thus brought to Christ, or *devoted* to God in him, as the infants of God's people had all along been own'd by an *initiating rite* down from *Abraham*: Or

(z) *Reflections*, p. 404. (a) *Def.* p. 63. [that

that there is any more impropriety in their being own'd as members of God's visible church, as they had been before own'd to be : Or that any thing in the christian doctrine forbids us to look upon the branches being *boly* along with their roots. But the contrary does appear. And why our Lord should *expresly mention* the application of the initiating rite to infants of professing christians, as *circumcision* had been under the former dispensations, any more than his *expresly* mentioning that the *supper* should take place of the *Jewish passover*, does not appear. — Nor has Mr. B. proved that there is the *least intimation* of christian parents being obliged to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, *before* they had solemnly devoted them to the Lord. — So that the *contrary* yet appears ; since if Christ had designed any *such alteration* with regard to the treatment of infants, among a people who had been ever accustomed to the application of an *initial rite* to their infants, we have great reason to conclude our Lord would have been *very expres* in signifying it.

And here I would observe, that the weight of the debate rests upon the decision of the following question.

The question is, *Whether our Lord's not having particularly and expresly specified INFANTS in the baptismal-commission, does [all circumstances taken together] amount to a prohibition of their baptism ? Or, whether [taking in all circumstances] an expres prohibition was not necessary to warrant us in denying baptism to infants ?*

For my own part, I think there can be no reason assigned why our Lord should neglect to give an *expres prohibition*, if it was his will that they should not be baptized. When I consider how *infants* had been treated under the *patriarchal*, and the *Mosaic* dispensations. — When I consider how our Lord did personally treat them. — And when I take notice of

F

several.

several expressions of his *apostles* in their favour. Particularly, that of children becoming *holy* upon the faith of a parent, who otherwise would have been *unclean*.

If it should be asked, *that since God had so expressly enjoined circumcision to Abraham's infant posterity, why was not Christ as express in his injunction of baptism to the infant-posterity of christian converts ?*

I should say, it was not necessary ; since by plain inference they would see it to be the *design* of the institution : Unless they could suppose, that God's oeconomy of grace to our world, which has been gradually *opening* and *enlarging* ever since *Abraham's* time till the coming of the *Messiah*, should then *abridge* and *curtail* the significations of favour to the human family !

When, *on the contrary*, the kingdom of the *Messiah* did carry those significations to their *zenith* of perfection, or gave them their highest amplification or enlargement. — What a strange and unnatural inference would it be against ourselves and offspring to suppose, that our Lord should *resume* a grant of favour made to *Abraham*, and in him to all that should *express like faith* with him !

Grants of favour are always in [force till a *resumption* of them takes place. Which *resumption*, in the case before us, Mr. B. should point out.

But that *infants* are capable subjects of *rights*, *privileges*, *grants*, or *favours*, tho' incapable of the sense of obligation whilst *infants*, the *greatest lawyers* have allowed. For as *Puffendorf* says, “ When any thing “ is to be transfer'd on a child, in way of *gift* or “ *legacy*, at first view, such a donation may seem “ invalid, because *acceptance* is a necessary condition “ required in the *receiver*, which cannot be per- “ formed without *deliberate consent*, and therefore “ not without the full use of reason. But because “ it would be an *intolerable hardship* to make chil- “ dren incapable of these advantages, on account “ of

“ of their *immaturity*, when, for that very reason,
 “ they have most need of the assistance of others;
 “ it is most agreeable to equity, that another per-
 “ son should *accept* this bounty in their name.—And
 “ for this trust, no man is so fit as the father. (b)”

The *law of nature and of nations* has ever allowed parents such a propriety in their *infant-offspring*, as to chuse their *guardians* for them when in view of their own death; and is it not *equally* right and fit, that they should, by the laws of God, be allowed to put them under the *same divine protection* with themselves whilst living? And this by a *solemn act* of dedication. Especially, as they and their parents are equally subjected to an *universal evil* without their own *consent* or *choice*, *viz. Death*. They must therefore have an *equal* need of the same remedy: And of consequence, as baptism did initiate the first christians into this *scheme of life*, their *infants*, by the most obvious reason, should be so initiated. — And till *death* does exempt the *infants* of christians from its stroke, their claim to this *seal* of the covenant of life must illude the force of all objection.

This is in perfect harmony with the design of the commission which our Lord gave his apostles, *viz. to baptize all nations*.

So that there was no manner of occasion for our Lord's *expresly* mentioning infants; since, by the most natural inference or implication, they are included in the commission. — The *supper* is allow'd to be properly partook of by the females, from *inference* or *implication*, — and many other things in christian practice might be mentioned.

As to the *rite of circumcision*, we might observe farther, that from its being attended with *pain* and *danger*, it demanded a *more explicite* command, with a *penalty* to enforce it; since no man has a right to inflict *pain* or expose to *danger* his *infant-offspring*,

(b) *Of the law of nature, &c. B. vi. ch. ii. sect. viii.*

but with a view to prevent a greater evil, or to procure a *desirable* good. Hence, the omission of circumcision, was threatned with a *cutting off* from God's people, *Gen.* xvii. 14. the *cutting off*, the *septuagint* renders by a word which signifies to *destroy* or *exterminate*, (c)—and so the *Chaldee* is observed to render it. (d)

But no occasion for such an *express* mention of infants being baptized under so *severe* a penalty, since baptism perform'd by *perfusion* or by *sprinkling* is attended with no *pain* or *danger* at all. — And to infer from the change of a *severe* and *less comprehensiv*e rite, into a rite that is *easy* and *more comprehensiv*e, as including both male and female, to infer from this *change* the *exclusion* of *both*, is surely very preposterous and absurd! — I might add, that the *antipaedobaptists* who insist upon an *express command* for the baptism of infants, without considering the manifest consequential reasons on which such baptism is supported, do venture to *expressly forbid* without any scripture-authority for so doing.

Men have no reason to condemn the baptism of infants on account of their *immature* state, since when we consider the origine of *moral entities*, or do oppose the condition of man to that of irrational animals, we shall find his *humanity* or natural state obliging to certain duties, and giving a title to certain rights, which he is said to enter upon very early :

For, says *Puffendorf*, “ this we conceive ought to
 “ be fixed on the very first moment, when any
 “ one may be truly called a man, tho' he as yet
 “ wants those perfections which will follow his na-
 “ ture in a longer course : That is, whensoever
 “ he begins to enjoy life and sense, tho his mother
 “ hath not yet deliver'd him into the world. Now
 “ because the obligations cannot be fulfilled by

(c) ἐξολοθρευθήσεται.

(d) See *Ainsworth* on the place.

“ him,

“ him, without he understand his own nature, and
 “ the ways of working, they for that reason do
 “ not actually exert their force, till he is able to
 “ square his actions by some rule, and to distinguish
 “ them by their proper differences. But the *rights*,
 “ on the contrary, date their validity from the
 “ very beginning of our being; inasmuch as they
 “ engage other persons already arrived at the full
 “ use of reason, to such and such performances
 “ towards us, and may turn to our benefit, even
 “ whilst we are incapable of apprehending the
 “ favour.” (e)

The baptizing of the *infants* of Christian parents,
 has therefore something in it very suitable to the
 Law of Nature and of nations, and cannot be
 said to be *premature*, since the humanity of the
 subject has already took place.

It is consequently too trifling to say, that be-
 cause infants are not, in so many words, appointed
 to be baptized, *as, you shall baptize all the infants of*
believers, that therefore they should not; since the
nature and design of the rite so applied, harmonizes
 with reason, truth, former dispensations of positive
 rites, and with the condition of the first Christians.

It is no objection that *infant-baptism* is, at best,
 built upon *inference* and *deduction*. Supposing this,—
 so are many *moral* duties and obligations: As
 our Lord has plainly shewn, in that precept, *that*
whatsoever we would that others should do to us, we
should do even the same to them. And moreover, both
 the *law* and the *prophets* urge moral obligation upon
 this principle.

There is an easy and natural deduction in the
 case before us; for children being thus devoted to
 God by baptism, have their duty to their parents
 enforced, by doing all *in the name of that Lord* to
 whom they have been devoted, and whose *name* has

(e) *Of the Law of Nature, &c.* B. I. ch. I. Sect. vii.

thus been named upon them. But without such a dedication they will not see themselves obliged, as thus *separated*, i. e. if we allow that baptism may be said to have any additional obligation to that of natural duty. *Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right*, Eph. vi. 1. It is supposed that *children* were exhorted to this behaviour, where one parent was an *heathen*, the other a *convert* to christianity; (f) and if so, the children must be understood as baptized; which they had a right to be, if *only one* parent was a christian, 1 Cor. vii. 14. But if it is the duty of christian's children to obey their parents *in the Lord*, as early as they are capable of discerning the obligation, they must see it resulting from their having been *devoted* or *separated* to the christian name or character, which is *equally* done by baptism to them and to their parents.

The argument from deduction briefly stands thus.

AGAINST *infant-baptism*

1. The plea is *silence* about them.
2. Not only no express mention in the precept, but none but *adult* persons are taken notice of, as baptized. *Therefore infants are excluded.*

FOR *infant-baptism*

1. *Silence* no more against than for them.
2. Households mentioned as baptized in virtue of the *faith* of their heads. Infants had ever been received into covenant with their parents since *Abraham*. — The *gospel* covenant, and the *Abrahamic* the same — infants actually concern'd in the death of *Jesus* — personally owned and blessed by him; and

(f) See *Pyle's Paraphrase*. Preface to the *Ephesians*, p. 41. declared

declared to be the standards of humility and purity to his disciples: *of such is the kingdom of heaven.*—No precept or example for christians bringing up their children in the christian faith till of mature age before baptism.

3. *Faith and repentance* requisite qualifications for baptism. *Therefore &c.*

3. *Faith and repentance* are requisite in adult persons; and so *Abraham* was commanded to be circumcised and his family because of his faith. But baptism may as well be applied to infants on the *faith* of their parents, as circumcision was applied on the *faith* of *Abraham*.

4. Our Lord was baptized at adult age. *Therefore &c.*

4. In *Jesus*, *faith* and *repentance* were not prerequisites; — in favour of infants.

5. The commission is to *teach* all nations baptizing them. *Therefore &c.*

5. Children are the proper, natural parts of all baptized nations or people; and therefore should be baptized.

6. Infant-baptism only to be defended on *inference* or *deduction*.

6. *Inference* or *deduction* so very plain and easy in favour of infant-baptism, that we imagine scarce any thing more plainly deduced from the

7. If baptism be a seal of a covenant, infants are not capable subjects of it, as they are not at the age of consent. For a covenant is a *compact* or *agreement* between *two* parties, at least.

8. The *conditions* of the gospel covenant are faith and repentance, but infants cannot perform the *conditions*, therefore should not have the seal.

the given circumstances of any general principle. The *voice of reason*, the *law of nature* and of *nations* lend their aid in support of the deduction.

7. Baptism seems to be as properly a *seal* of a covenant, as circumcision was. And infants are capable subjects of having the *seal*, tho' not, at the age of consent; since *God's covenant*, is more properly a *testament* or *will*, than a compact. *In which God is one.* The *principal* or *only* party making the *testament*, or *promise*, see *Gal. iii. 17,—21.* Therefore infants are as proper subjects of this covenant, as grown persons are.

8. Infants are subject to death, and that by virtue of the one offence, but as in *Adam* all die, so in *Christ* shall all be made alive—infants have then a share and concern in the gospel covenant as a *scheme of life*, and therefore should be acknowledged as the legatees of that

that testament, and as such, have a right to baptism.

There seems to have been a great *suitableness* in a converted Jewish parent's laying aside very gladly, the painful rite of circumcision, and applying in its stead, to his next born male infant, the *baptismal rite*; as hereby he gave evidence of his *repentance* and *change of mind* with regard to the religious rite in which he had before gloried. And I fancy Mr. B. would think it a strong evidence of a Jew's sincere repentance, or of his heartily *renouncing* Judaism, should he see such a *convert* applying *baptismal water* to his child, born after his own conversion, who, before his conversion, had always applied to his male children the *rite of circumcision*. — To proceed,

Mr. B. makes no scruple of declaring, “ that he believes great *Catholicism* to be consistent with denying that any other are *visible members of Christ's church*, than those who make profession of their *own faith*.” (g)

If by making profession of *their own faith*, he intends only such who are baptized in *adult age*, his catholicism may indeed be accounted *great*, as it is of the *marvellous*, or *mystical* kind; and will agree with that of those churches who deny any to be *christians*, or in a *salvable* state, but such as are within their *own pale* — but surely this is not so properly *Catholicism*, as that of allowing all to be *visible members of the christian church*, who profess to believe in Jesus, whether they are baptized in *infancy*, or in *adult age*, or have not been baptized at all, which is my *Catholicism*, and that of many of my friends.

(g) *Def. p. 47.*

G

I would

I would here observe, that as the *adult-baptizers* seem to lay their *whole stress* upon the *consent* of the subject of baptism; I do freely own the *rite*, in its first application, did require the *consent* of all adult-persons who embrac'd the christian doctrine, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*. — But then, it does at the same time appear, that *whole households* were entitled to baptism, upon the *consent* of their heads. And it was in like manner with circumcision. *Abraham's consent* was previously requisite to his own or his family's receiving the *seal* of the covenant. — But that *consent* of his was sufficient to entitle all his infant-descendants in every after-generation, as the *consent* of the *first converts* to christianity entitles their infant-descendants in all after-generations to the same rite.

The applying it to christian's *infant-descendants*, is in perfect harmony with the application of the antient rite of initiation. And with the utmost propriety is baptism applied to the *infant posterity* of the christian converts; since the christian covenant has included with them, their *most distant* seed. — Nor only so, but if God is, in Christ, the *father of men*, the *rite of initiation* should be applied to the children of those who claim an interest in that paternal relation. Neither needs any christian suppose, that *the God and father of Jesus* will refuse to be the God and father of his infant-offspring since he signified to *Abraham*, as the *Lord God Almighty*, that he would be the God of his seed after him — and accordingly demanded the application of the *token* of that covenant. — *Besides*, there is nothing to be done on the part of a grown person in the administration of the *baptismal rite*, but he is wholly a patient under it. *No profession of his faith, or of his repentance*, is demanded in the administration of it, from the *commission*, *Matth. xxviii. 19.* nor from the account we have of the apostles applying

plying baptism. But baptism was applied, as a *separating rite*, to *distinguish* those adult persons and their households, who had already embraced the christian doctrine, from the *infidel* Jews and Gentiles.

It seems plainly to be a *rite of separation* applicable *first* to grown persons who embraced christianity and their households, and *afterwards* to all their infant-descendants: And, in its own nature, it seems to differ from the *eucharist*, as much as the *rite of circumcision* differed from the *passover*.

The *one* only marks out, as devoted to God in Jesus, all who profess the christian religion with their offspring; the *other*, requires adult-age to *commemorate* an event. *Do this in remembrance of me.*—Where the person does *himself*, and *for himself* celebrate the rite. But in the rite of baptism, he is only acknowledged as a member of christ's visible church. The *one* requires *faith*, *love* and *gratitude*.—The *other* does not demand any mental exercise of the patient—but is the declaration of the *baptizer*, that such a one is *owned* and separated as a member of christ's *visible* church.

If this was duly considered, I humbly apprehend the matter in debate would soon be ended. And surely nothing can be more plain and evident, than that the *supper* was substituted in the room and stead of the *passover*. Which was a rite that called persons to *look back* and *reflect* on the divine favour with gratitude and affection—and there is no more impropriety in the *baptismal rite's* taking the place of *circumcision*. The *one*, as well as the *other*, is properly *initial*; or only a *rite of separation* or *distinction*. And therefore, not so properly a person's *own act and deed*, but *another's for him*, or *upon him*, whether *in infancy* or at *adult-years*. Which distinction in the *two rites* is so material, that if so understood, must remove all difficulty about the application of baptism to infants.

Besides, the obligation of this positive rite is as well complied with, by one who was baptized in infancy, as by one baptized in adult age. For, an ingenuous mind, who can bless God that he was born of christian parents, will rejoice in his having been *early separated* to God by the initial rite, and will determine to abide by the dedication. He looks upon himself as having been under the *care and protection* of his Lord, who took him under his wing when he hung upon his mother's breasts. He owns the fitness of the dedication; and by the holiness of his heart and life, he *confirms* the dedication. Nor can he, will he *reproach* his parents for making the dedication *without his consent*. — He sees the reasonableness of it; — that a true *parental affection* was expressed in it. That the extensive dominion of Jesus required an acknowledged propriety in him; since to this end he both died, and rose, and received, *viz.* that he might be *Lord both of the dead and of the living*.

I would, in the next place, refer my reader to Mr. B's argument, *two discourses*, p. 42. where he opposes " the none but *grown persons* being receiv'd " as *visible members* of the christian church, in proof " of its *state of maturity* and *full growth*, to the *infant state* of the Jewish church, if the *circum-* " cision of infants made them members of it." For,

He is much offended, because in citing him, I have added the word *full* to *growth*. (b) He says, " I altered his words for the pleasure of making " an *invidious personal* reflection upon him — to " bring him into *contempt*, at the same time I pre- " tend to speak in his commendation."

I own, that I have added the word *full*, and am persuaded that any impartial man will see that his reasoning will fairly admit of it. — His words are

(b) *Def. p. 47.*

these, " But it is an honour to the christian church, " a proof of its *state of maturity* and *full growth*, " that none but *grown persons*, making profession " of their *own faith*, and of their *own resolution* to " obey the mind of God, are received as *visible* " *members* of it." (i)

Now, if none but *grown persons* making profession of their *own faith*, and of their *own resolution* to obey the mind of God, do prove the state of *maturity* and *full growth* of the christian church, how have I injured Mr. B? — The term *full* added to *growth*, is no way injurious; but perfectly agreeable to his representation. — And yet I am willing Mr. B. shall be his own interpreter; and by *grown persons*, let him mean, persons *not fully grown* — but then, how this proves the *full growth* of the christian church, from their being *visible members*, is not quite so conspicuous; neither does it so well shew the force of his argument. Farther,

My *alteration* is not unjust; for if a person of twelve or of fourteen years of age can but make profession of his *own faith*, and of his *own resolution* to obey the mind of God, he is, by Mr. B's own confession, *fully grown*, or in other words, he is a *proper subject* of baptism. For Mr. B. has intimated, " that he himself has baptized several persons " before they came to *full growth*." (k) By which, no doubt, he means their *bodily growth*, at the same time he thought them at such a state of advancement in christian knowledge, as suits the *mature state*, the *full growth* of the christian church — otherwise his opposition to the *infant state* of the Jewish church, is but a lame opposition.

Mr. B. further says, " He is not sensible, that " the Jewish infants received any *spiritual* advancement, (which is what this author seems to mean " by *impartments* p. 38. l. 6.) by having the ordi-

(i) *Two Disc.* p. 46.

(k) *Def.* p. 47.

“ nance of circumcision administred to them;
 “ tho’ by the mark which it left in their flesh it
 “ gave occasion to enquire, when they grew up,
 “ what was the design of it, and might thereby
 “ afterwards prove the means of suggesting useful
 “ thoughts to their minds. And to me it is very
 “ clear, that no other infants, than those which
 “ lineally descended from *Abraham*, ever were
 “ parties in the covenant made with him.” (1)

What I have said in the place refer’d to, is this:
 “ We expect likewise to be shewn what *impartments*
 “ are made by baptism to a grown person, that an
 “ infant is not capable of receiving.” — This
 does not at all imply that I thought infants, in their
 baptism, do receive any *spiritual light* or *strength* —
 but stands directly oppos’d to the *antipaedobaptists*
 denying baptism to infants, as if some impartments
 attended it. And is supported by the drift of my
 argument. The sneer has nothing to support it;
 for I only assert, that as baptism does not *convey* or
impart any spiritual advantage either to adult per-
 sons or to infants, that therefore infants are as capa-
 ble subjects of baptism as grown persons. But as
 Mr. B. has well observed, “ that circumcision ad-
 “ ministred to infants might give them occasion to
 “ enquire, when they grew up, what was the de-
 “ sign of it, and might thereby afterwards prove
 “ the means of suggesting useful thoughts to their
 “ minds;” so the infants of christians when grown
 up, being assured that baptism had been applied to
 them, they would have as much occasion to en-
 quire what was the design of it; and so it will be-
 come the means of suggesting useful thoughts to
 their minds. And if this may be allowed to be a
spiritual advantage, I do allow that baptism is a
 proper means to this end. And Mr. B. should
 own it too.

(1) *Def.* p. 59.

But should Mr. B. pretend that the *mark in the flesh*, made by circumcision, had the *advantage* of baptism, in giving infants an *assurance* of their having had the *initiating seal* applied, which baptism does not do, as it leaves no mark in the flesh. — I would answer, that the *female Jews* had not this mark, and yet were assured of their being *parties* in the same covenant as well as the males. And not only so, but that *mark* could give the males no greater assurance of their being the *lineal descendants* of *Abraham*, than baptism does assure us that we are the *lineal descendants* of christians. — Their *book of the covenant*, their *sacred writings*, and the instructions of their *parents* and *guides*, were to inform them of the *original* of the appointment, and the *design* of the rite; and so the *New Testament*, our *parents friends*, &c. professing to *approve* and to have used the initial rite to their infant offspring, must be the *satisfactory ground* of childrens being persuaded that they have been thus dedicated. — Nor do I believe, that any *parents* or christian friends, have been ever under any temptation of deceiving children in this article. In most cases, there is either a *public* or a *private register* of such baptism.

But that no other infants, than those which lineally descended from *Abraham*, ever were parties in the covenant made with him, is not clear to me, tho' Mr. B. says that he is very clear in it.

It would seem strange, that the *profelytes* to the Jewish religion, should be admitted to the privileges of that constitution, and yet not be parties in the *Abrahamic* covenant, when they had embraced the faith of *Abraham*. To Jews and *Profelytes* was the effusion of the spirit made manifest at the day of *Pentecost*, [who had come from many distant countries, *Acts* ii. 10.] and this, before the apostles had any

any of them been sent to the Gentiles. And we find one of the *seven Deacons*, a PROSELYTE, even *Nicolas of Antioch*; who must have been circumcised, or the *Jews* would at this time have objected to him.

And many of these *proselytes* we are told, were at *Antioch*, ch. xiii. 43. such as had embraced the Jewish religion, [and who seem to have had the faith, or fidelity of *Abraham*,] who followed *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and were much better disposed than many of the *lineal descendants* of *Abraham*, see v. 45.

I cannot but think that these *proselytes* had been circumcised, and made parties in the covenant with *Abraham*; they seem to have had *circumcision*, the seal of the covenant by their worshipping with the *Jews*, and being admitted into offices with them in the christian church, in the very infancy of it; even before it appeared to the apostles that they were to go to the *Gentiles* or *Uncircumcised*.

It is not necessary that we suppose them to have intermarried with the tribes of *Israel*: Since without this, they might be parties in the covenant made with *Abraham*, as they enjoyed the *divine oracles*, and were favoured with a view of the *promises*, and also as under the more special protection of the Almighty, *he being their God*. — Nay, the pious proselyte would to greater advantage share the blessings of the *Abrahamic covenant* than the vicious, or impious *lineal descendants* of *Abraham*. — For *Abraham* was to be the father of all them that believed, even tho' they were not circumcised: and the father of the circumcision, more especially to such as walked in the steps of his faith, see *Rom.* iv. 11, 12.

To go on — Mr. B. is offended at my remarking upon this passage. “ But if the very same ceremony had been admitted to our Lord *Jesus* without his own consent or knowledge, he could not have been said therein to have fulfilled all righteousness

“*ousness*, or to have done a *righteous action*, because
 “ then indeed he had performed no action at all,
 “ but had been entirely passive.” (m)

Upon which I have said, “ that I take this to
 “ be a *mere quibble*: For Mr. B. should to the pur-
 “ pose have shewn, that our Lord’s having been
 “ *circumcised* was not a *fulfilling of righteousness*, as
 “ well as his being *baptized*; and that the rite of
 “ *circumcision*, which was a *fulfilling of righteousness*,
 “ was performed with his consent and know-
 “ ledge.” (n)

I am still of opinion, that tho’ our Lord was a
patient in point of circumcision, yet the circumcising
 of him was a fulfilling of the *same kind* of
 righteousness, with that fulfilled by his bap-
 tism, *viz.* a *positive* and *ritual* righteousness. And
 Mr. B. must himself allow it; since notwithstanding
 all he has said about positive institutions, he has
 expressly owned, “ That a disobedience to
 “ the divine command, respecting positive duties,
 “ is an immorality of a *different kind*, to the break-
 “ ing what we usually call a moral precept.” (o)—
 Now, if the *immorality* is of a *different kind*, surely
 the *righteousness* that there is in obeying the positive
 command, must also be of a *different kind*, to the
 righteousness that there is in obeying a moral pre-
 cept. It is therefore incumbent on Mr. B. to shew,
 what is the difference in the *kind of righteousness*
 fulfilled in baptism, and the *kind of righteousness*
 fulfilled in circumcision: And how these *two diffe-*
rent kinds of righteousness, differ from that *kind* which
 there is in obeying a moral precept.

But what if our Lord *did no action at all*, in the
 affair of his being circumcised, will it from thence
 follow, that righteousness was *not fulfilled* because
 he was entirely passive? which is Mr. B’s argu-

(m) *Two Disc.* p. 13.

(n) *Append.* p. 41.

(o) *Two Disc.* p. 19.

ment. — Then I conclude, that righteousness was *not fulfilled* when he was *baptized*. In the application of baptism, the *act and deed was not his own*, but *another's for him*. Yet, Mr. B. will have it, “that whatever righteousness there is in obeying the will of God, must be founded in our own *act and deed, and not another's for us.*” (p)

The *righteousness* fulfilled in baptism, I understand to be something *very distinct* from *moral* righteousness; and therefore conclude, that *consent* is not necessary in every subject, as it is in *all kinds of moral* righteousness.

And truly Mr. B. has all along reasoned upon the supposition of positive institutions being founded *merely* on the divine command. So that I see not with what face he can object to *righteousness being fulfilled* by the *rite's* being applied to a *mere patient*.

— Nor is it any objection that our Lord *consented*; for *John* came not baptizing till *Jesus* was of adult age; and therefore his *consent* was a thing requisite to the administration of the *baptismal rite*. It does not therefore follow, that *righteousness is not fulfilled*, where the subject of baptism is not at the age of consent. — It is certain, that in the *affair of circumcision* it was so fulfilled: For hence, the apostle *Paul*, as a *Jew*, reckoned so much upon his *having been circumcised on the eighth day*, Gal. iii. 5.

And we have an instance of baptism applied, where the grown persons baptized, do seem to have been *mere patients* in the application of the rite, Acts x. 47, 48. *Peter* does not ask them *their consent*, but enquires of his company, whether they had any objection to these *Gentiles* being baptized? and then he commanded that they should be baptized in the name of the Lord.

That *consent*, in the subject of baptism, is not essential to the *fulfilling of the righteousness* here spoken

of, is evident, from its being a righteousness of a *different kind* from what is *moral*, where *consent* is the very spirit of that righteousness. For tho' grown persons, at the *age of consent*, who had been just converted to christianity, should be willing to undergo the rite, or should not make resistance, yet in the very nature of it, it was more properly the incumbent duty of the first ministers of christianity to see that the rite was applied to them. For it is a *marking-out* or *separating* of persons.

The *consent* therefore of the persons *separating* must ever be essential, tho' not of the persons *separated*. As was the case of *circumcision* to all the infant descendants of *Abraham*, and is the case of *baptism* among all the infant descendants of christians. — And which seems to account for that *difference* which there is in that righteousness fulfilled by baptism, and that righteousness which is of eternal, immutable and moral obligation.

Besides, as *baptism* is only a *seal* or *token* of an *advantageous covenant*, it is not requisite that parents should wait the *age of consent*, before they apply it to their children; for all the laws of nature, or of reason will justify them in applying the *seal*, without their understanding the *design* of it.

And as the baptism of water is intended to *separate* from the infidel world, *all* that are put under the benefit of the gospel scheme; it thus fulfils *all that righteousness* which is to be found in this institution.

But *farther*, tho' it must be owned, that neither the *consent* of an infant circumcised, nor of an infant baptized can be had at the time of applying the rites, and so cannot belong to the *righteousness* fulfilled by the one rite or the other; yet the *approbation* of the subject may afterwards be obtained. — *Nay*, it is *more probable* that a person baptized in

Infancy will approve of his parents *act and deed*, than that a person not baptized at all, should think himself obliged to atone for his parents neglect; witness the great number of the children of *Anabaptists*, who live and die *unbaptized*, tho' arrived at years of discretion — will it not hence follow, that *more righteousness* is fulfilled by *baptizers of infants*, than is fulfilled by their *opponents*?

I might add, the *verb* render'd *suffer*, which expresses the pleading of our Lord with *John*, and also *John's compliance*, is the very same word made use of to express our Lord's *concern* about young children being brought to him, *SUFFER little children*, &c. *Matth. xix. 14.* compare *Mark x. 14.* *Luke xviii. 16.* If therefore *infants* are baptized in the name of Jesus, and so initiated into his kingdom, this is a *fulfilling of righteousness*, tho' they are not at the *age of consent*; since *whatever righteousness there is fulfilled* in the application of the rite, is founded in the *act and deed*. More especially, as the baptizing them does appear to be very conformable to the mind and will of Jesus, who would have *infants brought to him*, and reproves those disciples who presume to *forbid* them.

Righteousness had been thus *fulfilled* upon the person of our Lord, even where *knowledge* and *consent* did not appear, as in his *circumcision*; and was afterwards fulfilled upon him, in like manner, at his *burial*, in which there was an accomplishment of a prophecy, which related to his *making with the rich his grave*, see *Isa. liii. 9.* and *Dr. Sykes's Connection*, &c. p. 163.

Yet Mr. B. says, “ my quibble lies in putting
 “ *infant circumcision* and *adult baptism* upon the same
 “ foot of *fulfilling righteousness*, without making
 “ the necessary distinction between the subjects of
 “ the

“ the two ordinances: which distinction entirely
 “ changes the case with regard to the persons by
 “ whom the righteousness is fulfilled.” (q)

Mr. B. seems to think, that because our *Lord* was baptized at *adult-age*, and the *first christian converts* were so, that therefore it is unfair to suppose that the *righteousness* fulfilled in baptizing infants can be of the *same* kind with the *righteousness* fulfilled by infant circumcision: And charges me with quibbling for making the supposition.

But Mr. B. has owned that the righteousness fulfilled by baptism upon adult persons, is a *different kind* of righteousness to that fulfilled by obeying what we usually call a *moral* precept. And if *different*, perhaps there may be no quibbling in my putting the righteousness fulfilled by infant-circumcision upon the *same foot* with the righteousness fulfilled by adult-baptism. — For Mr. B. has all along reasoned upon the supposition of positive institutions being founded *merely* on the divine command: And of consequence, the righteousness fulfilled by baptism must be the *same kind* of righteousness with that fulfilled by circumcision; *baptism* and *circumcision* being alike positive institutions. Nor does it alter the nature of one or of the other, *viz.* that *Abraham* had the command to be circumcised when he was of *adult age*, and many of his family; or that our *Lord* and the first converts to his religion, were of *adult age* when the command for baptism was given, tho’ the infant-descendants of *Abraham* and of the *first christians*, were to be *equally* subject to the same positive rites with their adult parents.

It will therefore be no less than quibbling for a man to assert that *infant circumcision*, being the *same* rite applied to *Abraham* and his adult family, is not upon the *same foot* of fulfilling righteousness: Unless it can be shewn wherein the difference really

(q) *Def.* p. 67.

lies.

lies. Infant-circumcision succeeded adult-circumcision, and both, in my humble opinion, fulfilled the *same kind of righteousness*; and therefore I should conclude, that it may very safely be put upon the *same foot* with that of *baptism*, whether applied to *adult persons* or to *infants*.

Surely then, it must only be an *imaginary distinction*, that entirely changes the case, with regard to the persons by whom the righteousness is fulfilled.



S E C T. II.

Upon our Lord's going from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John.

THE better to enforce the practice of adult-baptizing, Mr. B. has laid *great stress* upon our Lord's going from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, see his *two discourses*, p. 2, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17. and his *defence*, p. 20, 21, 22.

In which he has asserted, "that our Lord underwent the fatigue of a journey on purpose to do the *greater honour* to a divine institution — and that otherwise he would not have travelled from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, when it might easily have been so ordered, that John should have come to him."

My remarks do greatly offend; (r) to which I refer my reader. — I yet think Mr. B. raises the positive institution so very high, that no part of

(r) *Append.* p. 12, 13.

the *example* of Jesus, respecting *moral obligation*, can have greater force. And all this, from no other authority than this *short, plain*, historical narrative, viz. *Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him*, Matth. iii. 13.

Mr. B. says, “ if his account of the matter is “ wrong, let this gentleman inform us, what “ was the principle upon which the journey was “ undertaken, what was the design of *Christ’s* “ coming to John, when he was at so great a distance, “ as from Galilee to Jordan? Why he did not stay “ till John came to him?” (s).

I am very ready to give the best account I can of it; without *adding* to, or *diminishing* from the history; or *injuring* the importance of it.

And according to St. *Matthew*, the fact, as I apprehend it, lies thus; ——— ‘ Jesus had had his ‘ usual residence at *Nazareth* in *Galilee*, till the time ‘ he was to put on a *publick* character. John went ‘ out sometime before his doing so, to *prepare* men ‘ to receive the *expected Messiah*. He did this, by ‘ *baptizing* men with the *baptism of repentance*, there- ‘ by signifying the *near approach* of a *new* dispensa- ‘ tion, or kingdom; and the people were greatly ‘ alarmed by it: insomuch that the *historian* says, ‘ that *all* of *Jerusalem* and of *Judea*, and of *all* the ‘ country about came, and were baptized of him. ‘ It was therefore most *natural* and *easy* for our Lord ‘ to follow his *Harbinger* to the place where he had ‘ been *preparing the way*. And as Jesus was to re- ‘ ceive a testimony of his being the *Messiah*, it would ‘ with much more propriety be given at the place ‘ of *publick baptism*, than at *Nazareth*; where our ‘ Lord had only sustained a *private* character; and ‘ where the *prejudices* of the people run so strong ‘ against him, that he had reason to reproach them

‘ by saying, a prophet is not without honour, save in his own country.’

This, I humbly imagine, does sufficiently account for the journey which our Lord made, in order to be baptized of *John*, without giving the history a *mystical* or *superstitious* turn. The *circumstances* do in themselves appear to have directed to such conduct. Nor does it seem, *that to have had it ordered otherwise*, could have been done with so much propriety.

Although, I freely own, that if our Lord had never took any journeys but this *one* to his baptism, a *peculiar emphasis* might have been laid upon it; especially by such, who thought it would afford some recommendation of their religious practice. But when I consider the *whole* of our Lord’s ministrations as attended with great labour and travail, journeyings and fatigues, I cannot be inclined to *point the emphasis* as Mr. B. has done on this journey.



S E C T. III.

Upon proselyte-baptism.

I WOULD next take some notice of Mr. B’s remarks about *proselyte-baptism*, from p. 36. to p. 43. of his *defence*.

In p. 39. he says, “ Let him prove that God ever required them, [*i. e.* the *Jews*] to baptize their proselytes.”

In answer, I think it is very proveable they were to do it, [if they had not had any express command for it,] from the very nature of the *Jew-
ish*

ish purifications ; and which any man may see, who attends carefully to the *Jewish* statutes and injunctions, as they lie in the *Mosaic Code*. For a purification by water was to be applied to a *Jew*, a *native Jew* when *legally defiled*, whether *male* or *female* ; even the *water of separation*, or of *sprinkling* : No re-admission to the unclean person without it, tho' the *separation* was occasioned only by the touch of a dead body. And as *Gentile converts* were esteemed, by their constitution, to be *naturally impure*, *unholy* or *defiled*, nothing can be a more rational conclusion, than that they and their families should be admitted into the *Jewish* polity, by *baptism*, or by the *water of sprinkling*. Neither does that passage quoted by *Ainsworth* from *Maimonides*, at all oppose this—which Mr. B. says, I prudently omitted, (t) viz. “ That a stranger who is circumcised and not “ baptizd, or baptizd and not circumcised, is “ not a proselyte till he be both circumcised and “ baptizd.” — But it agrees with the statute, *Numb. xv. 15.* *that one law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.* For altho' God's law did not require *baptism* as the rite of initiation to a *native Jew*, but *circumcision* was the *initial* rite into the *Abrahamic* covenant ; yet according to the *Jewish* constitution the unclean *Jews* were to be purified by water : And therefore the *Gentile* convert, if a *male*, must be both *circumcised* and *baptizd* in order to his admission. And in being so, it does appear that the stranger was subject to *one law*, and *one manner* with the *native Jew*. (u)

Besides, the supposing of *proselyte-baptism* does most naturally and easily account for *John's* coming and baptizing with water, as it had been the *anti-ent* custom of the priests to purify and cleanse, by

(t) *Def.* p. 40.

Challenge, from p. 18. to 23.

(u) See this more at large, in the

sprinkling of running-water upon the unclean: And thus, most probably, *initiating the proselyte into a new religion, or constitution.*

This seems to be hinted to us by our Lord, when he declares to *John*, that thus it became them to *fulfill all righteousness, i. e.* every important, every significative positive rite that God hath instituted. For *πληρωσαι*, says a *learned writer*, is to *comply with, or act according to a law or custom.* (w) So that the very phrase of *fulfilling all righteousness, or complying with a law or custom*, will intimate, that it was no *strange thing* among the *Jews*, to have the *rite of water-baptism* applied to proper subjects.

Mr. B. seems not pleased with my “referring to the *Rabbinical or Talmudical* writings, as I find their character from the hands of some considerable authors.” (x)

Whereas, all I contend for, is, their being likely to have retained such *customs about proselyting*, without any temptation to have corrupted the antient traditions; and may serve to illustrate *John’s baptism*, as well as be useful for the explaining those *other parts* of gospel history, which Mr. B. does allow. (y)

Mr. B. says, “that I have prudently passed over in silence, what is of the *greatest importance* in the controversy, relating to *their practice*, [i. e. the adult baptizer’s practice] as christians.” And he cites a large passage from his *two discourses*, p. 48, 49. “that if there had been any such practice among the *Jews* [as baptizing of proselytes] and our Lord had designed an analogy between their baptism, and that which he himself ordained, we can by no means believe, but that he would have told us *how far* the analogy should reach. *In short*; if baptism be an institution of Christ, and is to be practised in obe-

(w) Dr. D. Scott’s notes on the place.

(x) Def. p. 41.

(y) Ibid.

“ dience to his command : Then it must receive
 “ its full force from him ; and must be understood,
 “ as to its subject, as to its manner of administra-
 “ tion, and as to its continuance, according to
 “ those accounts, and those only, which himself
 “ and his immediate followers, commissioned by
 “ him, do give of it. Nor is there the least
 “ ground for supposing, that Christ would leave
 “ any ordinance of his own, relating to his own
 “ disciples, to be explained and applied according
 “ to a practice of men, who in that very practice
 “ had themselves no divine command to support
 “ them. (z) And he says that neither *Josephus* nor
 “ *Philo* make any mention of such baptism.” (a)

Please to observe, Mr. B. has rested the *weight*
of the argument here. This contains *what is of the*
greatest importance in the controversy relating to their
practice. And is, what he says, *I had prudently passed*
over in silence.

This, I think, I had not done. However to
 do him justice, I will give this *important passage* a
 more distinct consideration.

I have attempted to support the opinion of *prose-*
lyte-baptism among the Jews, from several authori-
 ties. Such as *Ainsworth*, *Lightfoot*, *Prideaux*, *God-*
win, &c. who are allowed to have well understood
 the *Rabbinical* and *Talmudical* writings. And tho’
 Mr. B. talks “ of the *miserable shifts* that learned
 “ men are put to, for producing the least *item* of
 “ an imaginary reference ;” (b) yet he has not
 shewn that these authors have mistook in those their
 citations, of which I have made some use.— Neither
 have I rested the argument upon those authorities
 from *Talmudical* writings ; but have shewn, from the
 very nature of the *Mosaic ordinances*, that the hea-
 then convert must undergo a *purification by water*.
 Which may satisfy us, tho’ neither *Josephus*, nor

(z) *Def.* p. 42, 43.(a) p. 42.
I. 2(b) *Ibid.*
Philo,

Philo, nor any *Talmudist* had taken notice of it. — Nor is the *silence of Josephus* of any weight, since he was an *artful, cautious* historian, when he had to do with *facts* that would give any advantage to the christians; as the learned Mr. *Lardner* has shewn. (c) *He would not so much as mention the affair of the Beth-lehem massacre of the infants.* His character is not the best, “for tho’ he was a very firm Jew, yet he
“ could point his ridicule at the *Pharisees* when giv-
“ ing account of a *scene of cruelty* exercised upon
“ them, and of the heavy sufferings which they
“ were under.” (d)

And might we not expect that such a man would conceal any usage, among the Jews, that would give advantage to the christian? As that would have done, viz. *their baptizing their proselytes* with a *baptism of repentance*, or with a baptism expressive of their renouncing their Gentilism; which would exactly correspond with *John’s* administering the *baptism of repentance* to Jews, who were by that admitted or enter’d into a new Constitution, into a nobler Polity, into the Kingdom of Heaven. And as to *Philo*, the *Alexandrian Jew*, I imagine little better could be expected from him. — Moreover, the use of *baptismal-water* was of *divine appointment* among the Jews; and therefore our Lord did not leave an ordinance of his own, to be explained and applied by a practice of men, that had no divine command to support it.

But farther, it does not appear that *water-baptism* had its *origine* in the institution of *Jesus*, which Mr. *B.* takes for granted: And therefore, when he says,
“ *In short*, if baptism be an institution of Christ,
“ and is to be practised in obedience to his com-
“ mand, then it must receive its full force from
“ him.” There is nothing in the conclusion: For it does not appear that *water-baptism* ow’d its rise to an

(c) See his *Credibility*, Vol. I. p. 441, 442.

(d) *Ibid.* p. 373.

institution of *Jesus*. On the other hand, it was what he himself submitted to, in order to fulfil all righteousness, or to comply with a law or custom that was of divine institution. And this his baptism was previous to his taking upon him a public character, or to his asserting any authority, as a LAW-GIVER, in the church or kingdom of God.

Our Lord did, it is true, after his resurrection, command his disciples to baptize into a more enlarged view of the divine manifestations; to wit, into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;—but he neither gave any new direction about the subjects of baptism, nor about the manner of its administration: He did therefore manifestly adopt an ordinance that was not of his own instituting, which was to be used by his own disciples, and with no other explanation of the *modus* of it than the practice of *John*, and the ancient usage of it among the Jews.—The difference of the doctrine of *John's* baptism and that of the Apostles, was, *John* came baptizing men into the coming, approaching kingdom of the Messiah. — The Apostles were to administer the baptismal rite, as signifying mens being admitted into a kingdom already come, wherein the Father displays himself thro' the mediation of his exalted Son, and by the influences of his spirit.— This appears to have been the true state of the case; and if so, Mr. B.'s reasonings, upon which he has laid the utmost stress, have no weight in them.

To proceed: Mr. B. once thought he had found out something from John i. 25. *Why baptizest thou, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, neither that Prophet?* The purport of which question, he says, seems to be, “*What authority hast thou to bring up a new religious ceremony?*” (e)

To which I have replied, “That they plainly had some notion of the rite, as sacred, and thought

(e) *Two Disc.* p. 46.

“ it fit to be used as the *initiatory ceremonial* into the “ kingdom of the Messiah.” (f)

And it does seem plain, from the gospel-history of *John's* baptism, and the manner in which the people treated it, that it was no *new* thing. They only enquire about his *authority*; for they manifestly saw, that it would *suit well* with that *anointed* person, whom *Isaiah* had foretold should *proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord*, *Isa. lxi. beg.* and therefore they flocked in to *John's* baptism.— And, perhaps, the *anointed* person there mentioned may be the ground of that first interrogation, *If thou art not THAT CHRIST?*— The next is, *Nor ELIAS?*— whom *Malachi* had prophesied of by name, *That the Lord would send to PURIFY the Sons of Levi, and PURGE them, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness*, *ch. iv. 5.* compared with *ch. iii.* the beginning.— The next character is, *Neither THAT PROPHET.*— Perhaps *that Prophet*, of whom *Moses* has foretold, *That the Lord our God will raise up like unto him*, *Deut. xviii. 15.*— If thou art none of these, *why dost thou baptize with the baptism of repentance?* Who can help thinking, that they must know that the *rite* was suitable to introduce into a *new* constitution, as it had been used to the *proselytes of righteousness*? They saw plainly, that *John*, by his baptism, called them to the expectation of a *new* state of things; and therefore their concern is to know whether he was the *true harbinger* anointed for that purpose.— But we never find any question put about the *signification* or *intention* of the rite; consequently, it is highly probable that they had been well acquainted with the use of it.— For my own part, I think it *certain*, that *proselyte-baptism* must have been in use among them; tho' I allow, it may be with others matter of *doubt* and *great uncertainty*.

Upon the whole, there seems to have been the utmost propriety in *John's* using *water* to initiate into the kingdom of *Jesus*, or to prepare men for it, as *water* had been the appointed, sacred mean of purifying from legal and ceremonial uncleannesses under the Jewish Theocracy; and as it is the natural mean of all external, bodily purifications among all men. — It is not, therefore, a rite enjoined by mere authority, or arbitrary will, but has a greater suitableness in it than any other mean of purification; and nothing can equal it, as an easy, natural, purifying symbol.

And hence, very pertinently, does the prophet *Isaiab* speak of the *Messiah*, as he that should sprinkle many nations, ch. lii. 15. And *Ezekiel* describes a most happy event, by God's sprinkling clean water upon them, in order to their being clean, ch. xxxvi. 25.



S E C T. IV.

Upon infants being esteemed the subjects of baptism.--- On Dr. Gale's excluding them from the ALL, Matt. 28, 19.--- and upon circumcision being a seal.

MR. B. says, " That if the principles, upon
 " which he builds in his *Second Discourse*,
 " are true, then it is fairly concluded,
 " that it was the mind of *Christ*, that all those, in
 " every age of the church, who are convinced of
 " the truth and divine authority of his doctrine,
 " should,

“ should, by baptism, take on themselves the pro-
 “ fession of it. And not only so, but it will like-
 “ wise follow, that it was not the mind of *Christ*,
 “ that any others should be baptized than those who
 “ make a *personal profession* of faith in him ; such a
 “ faith as includes repentance for sin, and hope in
 “ the mercy of God thro’ him. If it be true,
 “ that baptism has, throughout the New Testament,
 “ excepting only the single case of our Lord him-
 “ self, a view to repentance and turning from sin ;
 “ if it appears, that the *ordinance itself* was designed
 “ to exhibit the hope of pardon ; and if the baptism
 “ instituted by *Christ*, after his resurrection, does,
 “ in every baptized person, denote and take for
 “ granted an actual profession of such a faith in
 “ *Christ* as includes repentance for sin, and hope of
 “ pardon thro’ him ; then it could not be the mind
 “ of *Christ*, that any other should be baptized, than
 “ those who make such profession.” (g)

If Mr. B.’s principles or premises are true, every
 just conclusion that he draws from them will be true
 also. — But all he has said, or can ever be able to
 say, will not be sufficient to prove, *that it was the*
mind of Christ, that no others should be baptized, but such
only as make a personal profession of faith in him. And
 it is all along begging the question, which these
 gentlemen eternally do, *viz.* to lay down this as a prin-
 ciple, “ That because all nations were to be taught
 “ before they were baptized, therefore the children
 “ of the converts of all nations must *first* be edu-
 “ cated in the *christian* doctrine, before they have the
 “ *initiating rite* applied.” Which we deny they
 have any, the least, authority for.

The description he here gives of *baptism*, would
 much better suit the *memorial rite*, as by that rite
 men properly make a *personal profession of their faith*
in Jesus ; of such a faith as includes repentance for sin,

(g) Def. p. 23, 24.

and

and hope in the mercy of God thro' him. But baptism, I apprehend, can only be a rite *initial* into a constitution of grace and pardon; not a rite that demands the *mature* state or growth of the baptized, but merely the *adult's* embracing the *Christian* doctrine; on the doing of which, not only *he*, but his *whole family*, is intitled to the rite.

Mr. B. has made *Jesus* the *only single exception* to baptism's exhibiting the *hope of pardon*, or its expressing a *view to repentance*. An exception, I humbly imagine, of great weight in the argument; forasmuch as no *example* can be of more authority to shew, *that baptism may be applied to subjects, who have no sins to repent of*.— Even to *infants*, to whose *purity and innocency*, *Christ* has likened his own kingdom; and expressly has said, that it consists of persons, who have the *humility and inoffensiveness* of *little children*.

I add, our blessed Lord seems to have been initiated by baptism into his public ministry, not only that *John* might have an opportunity of observing the divine testimony given to his character, but that he himself might have the Spirit *poured out* upon him. For, before his baptism with water, it does not appear, that he had that *presence or effusion of the Spirit*, as he had after his baptism. Now if the *Christian's* Lord had not his *divine capacity* for his public office, till after his baptism, why may not infants be baptized, in order to their more gradually being made capable of the benefits and privileges of God's Kingdom under *Jesus*?

Mr. B. is truly so complaisant as to say, “ That infants are still *the care of heaven*; as much the care of heaven now, as they were in former ages; [but] yet the wisdom of God was sufficient to judge whether they should or should not, by baptism, be made *visible members of the Christian church*, that there was no need of *forbidding this rite to them*, it being sufficient reason for us to *forbear*

“ administ’ring it to them, that *Christ*, the author of
 “ our religion, did not appoint it to them ; but on the
 “ contrary gave such an account of the ordinance,
 “ as shew’d he did not think them the fit subjects
 “ of it.” (b)

It seems somewhat strange, that infants should be
 as much the care of heaven now, if *denied* an admis-
 sion into God’s kingdom under *Jesus* ; since under
 former dispensations, they were actually appointed
 of God to be initiated into his church or kingdom.
 — One would justly wonder that it should ever enter
 into the heart of man to imagine, from the gos-
 pel-history, that the *tender and compassionate Je-
 sus*, who shew’d such *particular and express affection*
 to infants, as to *take them up in his arms, and bless*
them, should exclude them a privilege which they had
 all along enjoy’d. He has not *forbid* their being
 brought to him, but reproved the *forbidding* them
 in his disciples. And if the *baptismal rite* is the ex-
 ternal signification of *adult persons coming to Jesus*,
 or embracing of his religion, the same rite seems
 most naturally applied to their *bringing their infants*
 to him. And the *nature of the rite* does no way
 forbid their being the subjects of it ; since the *righte-
 ousness fulfilled*, in the language of Mr. B. is founded
 in the *act and deed*, which is done as well for them as
 for grown persons.

Yet Mr. B. says, “ That our Lord gave such
 “ an account of the ordinance, as shew’d he did not
 “ think them fit subjects of it ; and that instead of
 “ any probability that it was administ’red to them
 “ by *John*, and the disciples of *Jesus*, it plainly ap-
 “ pears to us that it was not.” (i)

I should be glad to know *where our Lord has given*
any such account of the ordinance, as shew’d he did not
think infants the fit subjects of it. — Was this account
 from his being baptized himself, who had no sins to

(b) Def. p. 65.

(i) Def. p. 65.

repent

repent of? and who gave us no account of what *faith* he made profession of at his baptism; but only tells *John*, that he *ought* to baptize him, as by doing so, *righteousness would be fulfilled*.— Or does it appear, that *John* did not baptize *infants* along with their parents? The origine of *water-baptism* will lead one to suppose that he did; and will best account for the *silence* about children. Our Lord's own personal conduct to *infants* will confirm the supposition; and the conduct of the Apostles, in baptizing *whole households*, upon the *heads* of them embracing the Christian doctrine, renders it *highly probable*, if not *certain*, that infants were included in the commission given them to baptize *all nations*.

I know Dr. GALE insists much upon *teaching*, in the *general commission*, as standing related to the *all* who were to be baptized; and therefore will not allow *infants* to be any of those parts of the *all nations* that are to be baptized. (k)

But tho' we own that the *gospel*, wherever published, does demand the *credit* of adult persons *before* they are baptized, as well as the *faith* of *Abraham* was *pre-requisite* to God's entring into covenant with him, or the *Israelites* acknowledging *Moses* to be the Saviour whom God had raised up for them, before he could actually become so, in leading them out of *Egyptian-bondage*, and conducting them to *Canaan*; yet, their *infants*, in both cases, were *included* in the same covenant, and circumcised along with *Abraham*; as well as baptized *along with* their parents unto *Moses*, in the cloud and in the *sea*. And why? I answer, because God knew that *Abraham* would *teach* his household, and his children after him, to serve the Lord. — This was a moral reason, or shewed the *fitness* of their being taken into covenant with him, or of God's being the God of *Abraham*, and of *his seed*. — And the obligation of the *Mosaic*

(k) See his *Reflections* &c. p. 256. and onward.

covenant, was, that they *should teach their statutes and judgments to their sons, and to their sons sons*, Deut. iv. 8, 9. *Yea, that they should teach them DILIGENTLY unto their children*, vi. 7. Conformable to which, the *Christian baptism* stands properly related to *teaching*, as the baptized-adult are first taught, and by the *baptism* of their infants *do* stand obliged to teach them the *design and intention* of the *Christian doctrine*. And thus, I am persuaded, the Apostles answered the *end* of their mission, in baptizing *all* who embraced the *Christian doctrine*, and laying them under the obligation of bringing up their children *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*, by applying that *token or seal* of the covenant unto their households.

And it is but trifling to say, that if *infants* are thus included in the *all nations* that are baptized, then it would follow, that “all unbelievers and prophane blasphemers, all atheists, and the vilest debauchees, together with mere naturals and raving madmen, &c. that these are all parts of the *nations* as truly as infants.” (1)

For this I deny; and in the words of a *judicious friend*, must declare, “That they are but as *wens*, or “as *excrescences* in the human body. They are no “*natural* parts, but, if you will, they are *unnatural* “parts, or deformities.”—Whereas *infants* are the *natural, proper* parts of nations. We deny, as well as they, the baptizing of *adult infidels*; tho’ we think, that all those who belong to the *believing parts* of nations ought to be included under the *same seal*, as parts of *Christ’s visible church*, thus *separated* and devoted to God under *Jesus*, in like manner as the children of *Abraham* were included, devoted, and separated with their *father*; and as the children of the *Israelites* were, with their parents, *baptized* unto *Moses*.

(1) Dr. Gale’s *Reflector*. p. 256.

So that all that Mr. B. has said in his *defence*, about the *households* having *no children* in them, and of the *interests of children* under *former dispensations*, has no manner of weight with me. I refer my reader to his *Defence*, from p. 54. to p. 60. — He thinks it a “*mere presumption* to take for granted that there “*were infants in the baptized households* ;” and I apprehend it to be a *much more groundless presumption*, to take for granted that there were none.

Mr. B. tells me, “ That I should do well to consider, that circumcision is never, throughout the “*whole Scripture*, said to be a *seal* to any other “*person in the world* than to *Abraham* himself. “*Rom. iv. 11.* — Tho’ it is called a *token*, *Gen. xvii. “ 10, 11.*” (m)

What advantage he would gain by this, I know not ; for in the very place he cites, it is expressly called *God’s covenant*, which *Abraham* should keep between God and him, and his *seed* after him ; *his covenant*, as every man-child among them, of *Abraham’s* house, should be circumcised. And *circumcision* was to be the *token* of the covenant, as at *eight days* old every man-child was to be circumcised, comp. *ver. 12.* And his covenant was to be in their flesh, for an *everlasting covenant*.

Mr. B. indeed says, “ This it visibly was, [i. e. a “*token.*] But there is a vast difference between saying “*this*, and affirming what the Scripture *nowhere* “*does affirm*, that circumcision was to infants the “*seal of the covenant.*” (n)

Is this reasoning ? — Pray let Mr. B. shew, that the *Apostle* was warranted from the history of circumcision, to call it a *seal* of the covenant to *Abraham*, from any other view of it, than as it was a *token* of that covenant which God made with *him and his posterity* ? — But if *St. Paul* has called CIRCUMCISION, a SEAL to *Abraham*, tho’ the history only

(m) *Def.* p. 46.

(n) *Ibid.*

calls

calls it a *token* to him, and to his seed after him, I humbly imagine my *authority* in using the word *Seal* was as good as St. *Paul's* could make it. — And if Mr. *B.* takes offence at the word *Seal*, applied to circumcision, tho' circumcision was a *token* to *Abraham's* seed equally with *Abraham* himself, of the same covenant, — and when it was never intended to differ as a *token* in *Abraham's* flesh, from what it was to be in the flesh of his descendants. — If, I say, this offends, let Mr. *B.* endeavour to remove the offence. I am clear of the scandal, which must fall either upon Mr. *B.* or upon St. *Paul*; and the insinuation of my using too much freedom with Scripture, or affirming what it no where does affirm, returns with its proper force.

Yet Mr. *B.* thinks, “ That I do not act very advisedly in laying so much stress upon the thought “ that infants received the *seal of the covenant* under “ the dispensation of *Moses*; forasmuch as if I pursue this thought into all its consequences, it will “ prove that the *females*, who were excluded from “ receiving the *seal*, were excluded from the covenant itself; and then what will become of my “ argument, from circumcision under the Law, to “ the baptizing of infants, of both sexes, under “ the Gospel.” (o)

This, I have already shewn, has nothing formidable in it, in my *Plea for Infants*, p. 45. and onward.

But nevertheless, I shall remark, that tho' circumcision was the *seal* of the *Abrahamic* covenant, and only applicable to the males, it does not thence follow that the *females* were excluded from the covenant: But, on the contrary, the *seal* was itself a token to the *females*, inasmuch as they were confined and limited in their *cohabitations* by it; and so it served to keep a *distinct seed* or *family* till the *promised male-seed* should be born. To this end, their

(o) *Def.* p. 46.

inter-

inter-marriages with other nations was made a *capital crime*. See *Josh. xxiii. 12, 13.* and compare *Deut. vii. 3.*

I mention this, to shew, that the *females* were included in the covenant, tho' they had not the *seal* in their flesh. It answered to the purpose of keeping a distinct *family* or *seed*, which was strictly guarded by the most *severe laws*. So that every daughter, who possessed an inheritance in any tribe of the children of *Israel*, was indispensibly obliged to be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of *Israel* might enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers. See *Numb. xxxvi. 8.*

The importance of this, the *sacred historians* saw; two of the *Evangelists* have accordingly given the *genealogy* of our Lord, one of his mother, and the other of his supposed father. — This may suffice to point out the *extensive* view of the rite of circumcision, and shew, that tho' the *females* had not the token in their flesh, yet they were manifestly included in the self-same covenant which it sealed.

And very consistently with this, *baptism* appears to have succeeded in the *room* and *place* of circumcision; else why does the Apostle express himself as he does, *Gal. iii. 28. Col. iii. 11.* Neither *male* nor *female*, neither *circumcision* nor *uncircumcision*, but all are one in *Christ Jesus*? — What can this mean, unless he refers to *baptism*, as removing that distinction in the *application* of the rite which circumcision had made; which must intimate, that it has the *place*, and succeeds circumcision to advantage, or the Apostle's argument is unintelligible. — I cannot tell what made the difference between *male* and *female* under the *Abramic* covenant, if *circumcision*, to which the Apostle refers, did not. But *baptism* is that rite alone which can be opposed under the *Christian* covenant, as removing that difference. Now, if circumcision alone did constitute that difference,

rence, which baptism alone does remove, then baptism must *succeed* to circumcision, and be considered as supplying, to more friendly purposes, the *room* and *place* of circumcision. — *Moreover*, he spoke this of persons who had actually received *baptism*. — See *Gal.* iii. 27. — There was no difference of *male* and *female* among baptized *Christians*, as baptism had been equally applied to both. If this be not the design of *St. Paul's* reasoning, let *Mr. B.* shew what is.

Mr. B. thinks I have done injury to his argument, p. 59. of his *Two Discourses*, by adding those words, *Yet the Apostle makes no mention of any being baptized.* (p)

He had said, " That the argument taken from
 " the *silence of Scripture* concerning the baptizing of
 " the posterity of *Christian* parents, does indeed
 " make for the baptizing of them, instead of mak-
 " ing against it." — And afterwards — " it deserves
 " to be remarked, that even in the *Epistles* them-
 " selves, tho' written at a time when many of the
 " first converts, in the churches to which they were
 " directed, must have had children *grown up* to
 " years of understanding; yet the *Apostles* speak
 " of baptism as an ordinance to be observed, and
 " not to be laid aside."

In citing this last passage, instead of saying, *Yet the Apostles speak of baptism as an ordinance to be observed, and not to be laid aside*, I have put, *Yet the Apostles make no mention of any being baptized.* (q)

The thing is true *in fact*, and supported by what he had said before, *viz.* the *silence of Scripture* concerning the baptizing of their children, when grown up to years of understanding. — *Besides*, I made no use of this alteration to undermine or weaken his argument for the continuation of baptism: So that since his *premises* support the *conclusion* I drew from them, all the offence only lies in putting the alteration *under the cover of the same marks with his own words.*

(p) *Def.* p. 53.

(q) *Append.* p. 30.

For

For, the conclusion which I drew, I yet think *just*, and defy him to prove that the *Apostles* speak of baptism as an ordinance to be observed, and only applicable to their children, when brought up to years of understanding in the knowledge of the *Christian* doctrine. — But, *on the contrary*, I will venture to affirm, that if baptism is not to be applied to the *infants* of professing *Christians*, we have not the *least* authority from Scripture to apply it in the manner for which Mr. B. contends; it being contrary to the *known* *economy* of God, under every other dispensation, to *hinder* or *debar* infants of believers the *rite* of *initiation* into the church of God.

Once more, under this section, I am charged with *high crimes* not only against Mr. B. but against the *Evangelist Philip*. (r) See *Acts* viii. 37. which says, that *Philip* told the *Eunuch*, *That if he believed with all his heart he might be baptized*. “*Plainly intimating*, says “*Mr. B. that if he did not believe he must not be baptized.*” (s)

I reply, — “Let this answer of *Philip's* be “made a *rule* of baptism, and then none must be “baptized *but what believe with all their heart*; for “this, and nothing short of this, is in the answer; “but if so, no insincere person should ever be baptized, and will any pretend to say, they are judges “of the proper subjects of baptism?” (t)

What I have said is plainly drawn from this quotation, if *Philip's* answer be made a *rule* of baptism. — And I ask, Why did Mr. B. cite it as a *rule* of baptism, and comment upon it as such, if he will not allow it to be a *rule*? Mr. B. will truly allow it so far as suits his purpose, but no farther.

He will own, that the answer plainly intimates, *that if the Eunuch did not believe he must not be baptized*. But then, when I take in the *whole* of *Philip's* an-

(r) *Def.* p. 48, 49.

(s) *Two Disc.* p. 43.

(t) *Append.* p. 31.

swer, and say, If it be a rule of baptism, *then none must be baptized but what believe with all their heart*, Mr. B. takes fire for my *presuming* to take the words as they stand, and commenting upon them in their extent. Had I only said, *That hence believing must be a qualification for baptism*, I had pleased him; but neither to *add* nor *diminish* from the answer of *Philip*, "is to do great injury to *Philip*, in straining " his words beyond what the circumstances plainly " shew to be their design."

Let Mr. B. if he possibly can, draw a more direct, plain, and conclusive consequence from the letter of the commission, *Matt. xxviii. 19.* in favour of every subject of baptism being *first taught*; and then prove he has not *equally strained* the design of them, and done injury to the blessed *Jesus*, before he pretends to fix his charge of my doing injury to *Philip*.

I might add, Mr. B. has done manifest injury to *Philip*, by making what he said to the *Eunuch* a rule of baptism, which will plainly appear from our offering the same violence to that declaration of our Lord's, *Mark xvi. 16. He that believeth not shall be damned.*

Mr. B.'s implication stands thus:

None but believers must be admitted to baptism.

But, Infants are not believers.

Ergo: Infants must not be baptized.

The words of our Lord stand thus:

He that believeth shall not be damned.

But, Infants do not believe.

Ergo: Infants shall be damned.

If Mr. B. will allow the former to be good reasoning, I defy him to *disprove* the latter.

But

But if we must not suppose infants *incapable* of becoming the subjects of the kingdom of heaven, by reason of their dying under a *natural* or *physical* incapacity of faith, why must we suppose them incapable of a *rite* which is only significative of the privileges of that kingdom?

The adult person, who *believes not*, is condemned for a *moral defect*, not for a *natural one*.

Those words of *Philip's*, *If thou believest with all thine heart*, were a very kind and serious hint given to the *Eunuch*, which it was his business to examine into. — And it is certain that an *adult person* is guilty of great hypocrisy, who desires baptism, and yet does not believe that *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*; but if such a person, who is in his heart an *infidel*, will demand baptism of *Mr. B.* I see not how he can deny him. — *Mr. B.* may say, that such a one makes *confession with his mouth*; but that he may do, and yet be infinitely farther off from *believing with all his heart* than an *innocent infant*, as his unbelief is of a *moral nature*, and the want of faith in the infant is only the want of a *natural capacity*.

But he says, “ In answer to my *taunting question*, “ he answers in behalf of himself and his brethren; “ *we are judges of the subjects of baptism* by the profession which they make, which profession, if “ they be unsincere in it, they must answer for it, “ and not we.” (u)

I *reply*, Neither *Mr. B.* nor his brethren are competent judges of the *subjects* of baptism, if *Philip's* answer is a *rule* of baptism, for which *Mr. B.* quoted it. — And notwithstanding the ungenerous treatment of *Mr. B.'s*, I have the inward pleasure arising from a consciousness of due reverence for the *Evangelist*, from a real esteem for every *good man*; and do abhor the design of vilifying either a *sacred character*, or that of any *professor of Christianity*, or

even that of an *infidel*; much more that of a *whole* body of men, whom I have ever owned as *Christians*, or *visible members* of *Christ's church*.— But if Mr. B. can think impartially, he must own, that I am not guilty, but he himself has done the *injury*, if any is done to *Philip*.



S E C T. V.

Upon the mode of baptism; and upon the Word βαπτίζω, as used, 1 Cor. x. 2.

MR. B. in his *Defence*, charges me with a *mean quibble* in defending the application of the word, βαπτίζω, to a *partial* use of water; or denying, that it always, in the *New Testament*, signifies to *plunge*. Particularly, for asserting that we have an idea of *baptism* without plunging, in the *ISRAELITES* being baptized unto *MOSES* in the *cloud* and in the *sea*.— And he will have it, “ That even here, there was that *encompassing* and “ *overwhelming* of their bodies, which is the very “ design of the action of plunging, and the ne- “ cessary effect of it, when a person is put into the “ water.— If a body is *overwhelmed with a cloud*, “ especially in that extraordinary manner in which “ the *Israelites* were *overwhelmed*; when God was “ pleased, on special occasions, to make his appear- “ ance among them, that body may very well, in “ an allusive sense, be said to be *baptized in the cloud*, “ that is, *dipped in the cloud*, tho’ no hand is made “ use of to perform the action of plunging. And “ in

“ in the like allusive sense, the *Israelites* were fitly
 “ enough said to be *baptized in the sea*, tho’ they
 “ were not, in strictness of speech, *plunged into it*;
 “ nor indeed, in strictness of speech, could they be
 “ said to be *in the sea*, tho’ encompassed by it in
 “ such a manner as will, with infinitely more pro-
 “ priety, bear the resemblance of being plunged
 “ in it, than if only some drops of it had been
 “ sprinkled or poured upon them.” (x)

This citation is sufficient, of itself, to shew how far Mr. B. will take pains to rack his invention, rather than part with his *confined* sense of the word, βαπτίζω. — But would he not call this a *mean subterfuge* in an adversary? — What *overwhelming* and *encompassing* can any man imagine, either of the cloud or of the sea did attend the *Israelites*, that can bear the least resemblance to mens being *plunged over head*, or *all over in water*?

It will be proper to attend to the *history*, and see if there be any thing in it to support such an imagination; and in *Exod. xiii. 21.* we have an account of the Lord’s going before the *Israelites* by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them the way. And in the *xiv. 19, 20.* The Angel of God, which went BEFORE the camp of Israel, removed, and went BEHIND them, and the pillar of the cloud came BETWEEN the camp of Israel and the camp of the Egyptians. — Does this look any thing like an *encompassing* or an *overwhelming* of their bodies? Could the bodies of the *Israelites* be said, with any propriety, even in an *allusive sense*, to be dipped or *plunged* in the cloud? — Surely Mr. B. was *overwhelmed* in a cloud when he thus attempted to support his confined sense of the word, βαπτίζω. The cloud was behind them, *i. e.* between them and the *Egyptians*; and this was the cloud of *separation*, which answered to the design of *baptism*, and which is to distinguish men and their children from the in-

fidel world, as the cloud separated the *Israelites* and their children from the *Egyptians*. This, I humbly suppose, St. Paul had in his eye, when he applied the word, *baptize*, to the cloud, as bearing so great an analogy with *Christian* baptism; but no encompassing, no overwhelming at all in it.

And as to his allusive sense of *plunging in the sea*, there is as great impropriety in that. — For, *Exod. xiv. 22. The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.*

Here Mr. B.'s allusive sense of the word seems to be full as obscure as that of the cloud. — For what resemblance between being plunged in a river, and mens walking thro' a wide passage made in the sea, on the dry ground, tho' the waters stood as walls on the *outsides* of the thousands of *Israel*; which waters neither inclosed them *behind* nor *before*; no, nor hung over them. I freely confess, that could I imagine a resemblance here, or fancy an encompassing or overwhelming like that of the water's encompassing or overwhelming a plunged body, dipped quite over in it, I should think myself capable of finding a resemblance in any two *disparates*, or things most dissimilar and unlike in their appearance.

But, — one would be tempted to think that this reasoner had substituted an idea of the *Egyptians* concern in the sea, rather than that of the *Israelites*. And it would suit well his allusive sense, or his argument, if St. Paul had happened to have said, that the *Egyptians* were so baptized.

Mr. B. to be sure, did not think it would make for his purpose, or he might have found, in the idea of St. Paul, a beautiful allusion in the word *baptize*, applied to this separation of the *Israelites* unto *Moses*; since both parents and their infants were baptized together, and thus separated to the conduct and guidance of *Moses*; which corresponds with

Christian

Christian parents and their *households* being taken into the *Christian* covenant together, or *separated* to the guidance and conduct of *Jesus*, by baptism. What could be a motive to *St. Paul*'s using the word *Βαπτισμῶ*, in this place, if he had seen no analogy between that *separation* and the *Christian baptismal-separation*? — But if *St. Paul* had considered *Christian-baptism* as *separating* parents from their infants, or as leaving their infants out of the same saving *intention* or *scheme*, then he would not have used the term *baptize* with any propriety; but if he saw an *analogy* between the baptism of the *Israelites* and the baptism of *Christians*, infants must then be included under both, or the analogy is lost, and the *allusive sense* left very obscure and unintelligible. But the *infants* of the *Israelites*, or those under *adult age*, were the *only* persons who received the benefit of this *separation* unto *Moses*, by reaching the possession of the promised land, except *Caleb* and *Joshua*; therefore *their concern* in this baptism was of the most importance. See *Josh. v. 4, 5, 6*.

Here the *allusive sense* will again appear beautiful: Forasmuch as few of those who possessed the *earthly Canaan* had had *adult-baptism*, so there are few among *Christians*, comparatively, who shall possess the *heavenly Canaan*, who were *initiated* into the *Christian* covenant by *adult-baptism*. *Converts* were initiated and all their households together, but none of their descendants brought up in the profession of the *Christian* religion, can be properly said to be *initiated* by baptism in *adult age*; since from children they had been trained up in the *nurture and admonition of the Lord*, or had a claim to be so educated, as the *seed of Christian* parents.

And *baptism*, in the sense of *St. Paul*, includes *infants with their parents*, under the same rite.

Nor do I know a better argument for the *continuance* of *water-baptism*, among *Christians*, than its being

ing a *rite* of *separation* or *dedication* of the infant-*seed* of *Christian* converts in all ages and nations, who are to be treated as thus *separated to God in Christ*, for holy use.

And thus the obligation is transmitted down from generation to generation: For, as my parents thus obliged themselves to express their homage and fealty in *devoting* me, their infant-offspring, and thus fixing their obligation to educate me in the same faith; so I make the *return*, in *devoting* and educating mine in the same faith. And without this way of *initiation*, *baptism* might be lost in the world, or there might not be any apparent seed to serve the ascended *Jesus*, who should be *accounted to him for a generation*; since upon Mr. B.'s principles and practice, none must be admitted as the *visible* members of *Christ's* church, but such as profess their own faith by baptism: And the *few* that actually do so in the world, is so very small at this day, that by no very high figure, we might say, his church is *almost invisible* among men.

Mr. B. has put me upon this *allusive* way of reasoning; and whether it be not fully as conclusive as his, from St. Paul's representation of the *Israelites* being *baptized in the cloud and in the sea*, I leave to the judgment of my readers.

As to the *emphasis* which Mr. B. has laid on that expression, *Mark* i. 9. viz. *John's baptizing into Jordan*,—I have remarked, “That it darkens the
“rendring. That the *preposition* is intelligible
“when understood to express a *baptizing* into the
“religion of *Moses*, or of *Christ*; and so putting on
“the religion of the one or of the other: But
“*John's baptizing into Jordan* has something *uncouth*
“in it, as *emphatical* as it is, unless it be *mystically*
“understood that he baptized him into the *faith* or
“*profession of Jordan*.” (y)

(y) *Append.* p. 15, 16.

In my shewing the impropriety of such an emphatical sense of *eis*, I have mistook *eu* for it, in *Rom. vi. 4.* which *Mr. B.* charges upon me. (2)

But I do assure him, it was not with *design*; neither was it for want of instances enough, where *eis* would have as well suited my purpose; but was entirely owing to *oversight*.

But as *Mr. B.* wonders at my *assurance* in affirming the contrary, (a) and continues to insist upon the preposition as *emphatical*, when related to *Jordan*, as if that *confirmed* or *strengthened* the argument for *plunging*; (b) I shall observe, that it seems to be a very mistaken way of laying an *emphasis*; since the preposition, so rendred, diverts the mind from the *true end* of baptism: For *eis*, when related to *βαπτίζω*, does express the *end* of baptism most usually, if not always, as in the aforementioned place, *1 Cor. x. 2.* where it governs the *same case*, as in *Mark i. 9.* and is rendred *unto* [*Moses.*]

In which place, *eis tou Μωϋση*, does express the *proper end* of that baptism of the *Israelites*, as by means of the *cloud* and of the *sea*, they were delivered from their *Egyptian* enemies, and put under the guidance and conduct of *Moses*. — Here the *eis* is intelligible, as it expresses the *end* of baptism, and the *eu* does intend to express the *means* of their baptism. And so the *eis* is to be understood in many places; as *Matth. xxviii. 19.* baptizing them *in* the name of the Father, &c. or initiating them *into* a Constitution which display'd the love of the Father to men, as *universal*, by or thro' the *medium* of the *word incarnate*; own'd to be the *Son of God*, in the highest sense, by the miraculous impartments of *wisdom* and *power*, made to his Apostles and Ministers, who promulgated his gospel. Here the *eis* is expressive of the *end* of baptism. — But when the Apostles

(x) *Def. p. 28.* (a) *Def. p. 27.* (b) *Def. p. 32, 31.*
comp. *Two Disc. p. 28.*

actions are spoken of, relative to the authority by which they acted, then it is *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, *Acts* iii. 6. *In whose name*, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*. iv. 7. — And it governs the *same case*, *Rom.* vi. 3. where it expresses a being baptized into *Christ's* death, or mens obligation to die to sin; or to crucify the *old man*, that the body of sin might be destroy'd. The *into* does not point at the *mode* of baptism, but at the *end* of it. — *Acts* xix. 3. it is rendred, *unto John's* baptism, not *into Jordan*, or *into* the water wherewith *John* baptized, but *unto* or *into* his *baptism*, which was a *baptism of repentance*. — If any where the *eis* should be so *emphatical* as to signify *plunging*, one would expect it had been so used in this place, where it is *Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου Βαπτισμῶν*. But the *eis* answers to *what dispensation*? And so it seems to do every where when render'd *into* or *unto*, and not *into* what river or water. *Comp.* *1 Cor.* i. 13, 15, and *Gal.* iii. 27.

Thus are we said to be all baptized *into* one body, *1 Cor.* xii. 13. which surely none can suppose to signify the *mode* of baptism, but intends to express mens being initiated *into* one society. If, therefore, when *St. Mark* uses the preposition *eis*, to express our Lord's being baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, it must be render'd, as *Mr. B.* would have it, *into*, it will be a very *singular* rendring; since, when so render'd in all other places, it signifies some *end*. — So *St. Paul* uses it, in relation to other things. See *2 Thess.* ii. 10, 11. — *That they might be saved*. — *That they should believe a lie*. *Eis*, i. e. *to the end they might be saved*, &c. I should rather think the *eis*, in *Mark* i. 9. must properly signify the *place*; as *in*, *by*, or *towards Jordan*. *St. Paul* uses it to signify *towards* a place, *Acts* xxviii. 14. — And so we went *towards Rome*. Where the preposition governs the *same case*; which cannot mean *into Rome*, from the next verse telling us, that from thence the brethren met them short of *Rome*. — It signifies *towards* a being, *Luk.* xvi. 21.

Es *O* *ow*, towards God, not *into* God. — And it is render'd *towards*, three times in one verse, 1 *Thess.* iii. 12. — and *towards*, 2 *Ep.* i. 3. and *to*, 1 *Ep.* v. 15. to all men. So that if *toward* be a proper rendring of the preposition, why may we not suppose that *Mark* represents *John*, as baptizing *Jesus*, in some place *by*, or *towards* *Jordan*?

Mr. *B.* says, indeed, “ That it is no pleasure to him to engage in *criticisms*, but his opponent will force him to it. That he makes no difficulty to allow that the *Greek* preposition *es*, according as it is joined with other words in the sentence, is sometimes used to signify *in*, and sometimes *among*, as well as most usually *into*, which is its *native* and *primary* sense.” (c) But then, in his *Defence*, p. 30. he says, “ He is still of the same mind.” i. e. as to the rendring of the preposition *es*, in *Mark* i. 9.

The gentleman should be pitied, if this was true. — But I am obliged to ask, — What can he mean by *my forcing him to engage in criticism*, when he himself began with the *emphatical* sense of *es*, and gave it that *singular, uncouth* rendring, viz. *INTO Jordan*? — Whether he has considered it, in its proper relation to other words in the sentence, I now leave others to judge. — I think he has not; and to me, his rendring it *into*, in that place, seems to have nothing but his *own imagination* to support it; for there it surely is relative to *place*, and not to the *action* of baptizing. — The *texts* which I cited, to shew the impropriety of his *emphasis*, were *Matth.* xv. 24. *Acts* ii. 38. vii. 53. (d) — Which texts, he says, might as well be rendered a baptizing *into* the remission of sins, as *unto*. And our Lord was sent *into* the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*, as well as *unto*. — And by the disposition of angels, *among* or *into* the midst of military orders of angels. (e) — And

(c) *Def.* p. 28. (d) *Append.* p. 16. (e) *Def.* p. 29.

if he had rendered it *among*, in this text in *Mark*, I should not differ with him, i. e. if he supplied, *among the rivulets of Jordan*.—I would refer my reader to a late Tract, call'd, *A Review and Vindication of a late Treatise on the Subject and Mode of Baptism*, from p. 44. to 47. which well supports such rendering as *among*.

But Mr. B. says, “ There will be greater difficulty than I imagine, in supposing our Lord was not plunged when he was baptized, if I compare the words of St. *Matth.* iii. 16. *Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water*; as it is said of *Philip* and the *Eunuch*, *Acts* viii. 38. yet when St. *Mark* says expressly, that *John* baptized *Jesus into Jordan*, and there is no room for a figurative meaning; and when St. *Matthew*, the other Evangelist, assures us, that *Jesus being baptized, went up straightway from the water*: ”—Hence he concludes our Lord was *plunged*. And he says farther, “ That if *Mark* does not mean *into Jordan*, what is the meaning of *eis to udap*, in the *Acts*, when applied to *Philip* and the *Eunuch*? ” (f)

I tell the gentleman, that notwithstanding his offence at my making use of the *Greek*, I am so far qualified as to discern, that his use of the *eis* is very whimsical; and I deny, that it, with propriety, can signify *INTO*, where he says it is the *express* sense and *emphatical*.

But as to our Lord's *coming up straightway from the water*.—And their *coming up out of the water*, mentioned in the *Acts*.—All Mr. B. has said upon this (g), appears to me very inconclusive: For, allowing, that they *went down* into the water, and *came up out of the water*, the *going down* or the *coming up out of*, will by no means express or intimate what was the *action of baptizing*; but only do represent the *joint action of Philip* and of the *Eunuch*, *before and after baptism*; and therefore, to infer *plunging* from hence,

(f) *Def.* p. 29.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 30, 31.

discovers

discovers too great prejudice.— *Besides*, if the actions of *going down*, and *coming up out of*, did indicate *plunging*, it would equally shew, that *Philip* was plunged with the *Eunuch*.

Moreover, it is well known, that the country where they were, was a *land of hills and of valleys*. To come, therefore, at the water in the valleys, they must *go down* to them; and to leave them, they must *come up* from them.— But a *going down into the water*, must be determined in its sense and import, from the *design* and *end* of so *going down*. This, in the case before us, was to make use of *some water* for baptism; but the *quantity* to be made use of, will not be determined, either by the *going down into the water*, or the *coming up out of* it. It no way explains the *mode* of the action itself, either of *John's* applying water to *Jesus*, or of *Philip's* applying water to the *Eunuch*.

The text in *Matthew* has *απο, from*; but our Lord's baptism was quite over before he thus ascended *from* the water; which, surely, he might do without having been *plunged*. Nor does it appear from the *Bible History*, that *John* was authorized to *plunge* [in baptizing] either our Lord or any other person, *but the contrary*; forasmuch, as the *sacramental use of water* among the *Jewish priests* had ever been by *sprinkling*. I mean that water, called the *water of separation*, which seems to have had a correspondent design with *John's baptism*, supposed to be applied also to the *proselytes of righteousness*. — For *John* was of the *race of the priests*, the son of *Zacharias*; so that it is incumbent on Mr. B. to shew what *authority John* had for *plunging*, or using baptismal water *contrary* to the appointed custom of using the purifying water. — The word *βαπτίζω* will not be of any avail, since it has been observed, that the *Greek language* has many other words of *lesser latitude*, and which would not have been capable of signifying *less* than *plunging*. (b)

(b) See the *Challenge*, p. 17. Note.

I might

I might have observed, that no greater stress should be laid upon the phrase, *coming out of*, than upon the phrase, *coming from* a place; since Dr. Scott has observed, that the Syriac makes no distinction between *απο*, which we render *from*, and *ἐκ*, which we render *out of*. (i)

Mr. B.'s great acquaintance with the Greek, must enable him to know what others affirm, who are very conversant with the best Greek writers, viz. that *απο* signifies *from*, as properly as it does *out of*; and that there is no manner of stress to be laid upon it, in the present controversy.

I add, — Unless it may have its sense determined by the relation which it has to the verb, βαπτίζω. — But as Mr. B. allows that *εἰς* is to be understood to signify *in* or *among*, as well as *into*; as it is joined with other words in the sentence: (k) So I should think, that *απο*, and *ἐκ* too, may signify *from*, when joined with βαπτίζω. — Since it has been sufficiently shewn, “ That βαπτίζω manifestly signifies to pour on
“ water. That it usually denotes a very different
“ action of applying some liquid to a subject, to what βαπτίζω
“ does; which denotes, the putting somewhat into a
“ liquid; and that this might be proved even from
“ those Greek authors, cited by Dr. Gale. (l)

“ And that whatever the word βαπτίζω signifies, it
“ matters not in the present case; since, tho’ it is
“ frequently used in the *New Testament*, where dipping
“ into is plainly intended, it is never there used
“ with regard to the ordinance of BAPTISM. Our
“ Lord’s forerunner is never called, ὁ βαπτίζων, the Dip-
“ per. The sacramental washing, instituted by Christ,
“ is no where called βάπτισμα, or by any word that un-
“ deniably imports dipping. And the act of adminis-
“ trating baptism is always expressed by βαπτίζω, not

(i) See his Notes on *Matth. iii. 16.* (k) *Def. p. 28.*

(l) See a *Treatise on the Subjects and Mode of Baptism*, p. 43. and onwards.

“ by

“ by *bapto*. The question then is, What does this
 “ verb *baptizo* import? And the true answer is
 “ this: It signifies either to *wash*, which way soever
 “ the washing is performed, or particularly to *pour*
 “ *on* or *sprinkle*.” (m)

This writer has, with great judgment, made and
 supported the *distinction*; as may be seen in the *Treatise*
 referred to in the *margin*. And, with the utmost
 propriety, *baptism* does appear to be an application of
water to a body, and not the application of *a body to*
water.

It was ever so used, as *sacramental-water*. It in-
 tends no more, in the baptism of the *Spirit* than a
pouring on. In the baptism of *blood*, it intends only
 a *partial* application; and from the baptismal appli-
 cation of water in the New Testament, it appears to
 have been made, by having the body for the *subject*
 of such baptisms.—It was not likely, that the *Jaylor*
 and his whole family should be *plunged* in his house;
 neither that those *other households* should be plunged,
 nor that the 3000 should be plunged, *men* and *women*,
 and, most probably, *children* together.

Tho' Mr. B. “ will have it *much more probable*,
 “ (n) that they separated from their infants at their
 “ baptism, committing them for a few moments to
 “ some by-standers, who had no children present,
 “ than that they offered *incapable subjects* to the
 “ administration of that ordinance; since, as soon
 “ as they themselves were baptized, they might take
 “ their infants again, and go home.”

The very notion or apprehension of their infants
 being *incapable subjects*, must have greatly alarm'd
 this *Jewish* multitude! and does appear in so *obnoxious*
 and *offensive* a view, that not any thing was more
 likely to have given them a *disgust* to *Christianity*.—
 Can any man, who attends to the New Testament

(m) See the *Review and Vindication of a late Treatise*, &c.
 p. 31.

(n) *Def.* p. 58.

accounts of this people, once imagine, that they would *tamely*, and without *any reluctancy*, submit to a rite of initiation, and put their infants into the arms of others, or be *separated* from them when they themselves were baptized? — A *people*, who had always looked upon their children as *included* with themselves in all the divine purposes, either of *mercy* or of *judgment*, towards them!

Let any man consider this 3000, as most probably having in it some of that very multitude, mentioned, *Matth. xxvii. 25.* who thus answered *Pilate*, — *His blood be on us, and on our children!* and then, let him make *Mr. B.'s separation*, if he is able. — Would they not be solicitous as for themselves, so for their children, upon whom they had imprecated the *curse*, to be included in the dispensation of pardon? — They were a people that would always *covenant* and *engage* for their children, as well as themselves; and were *unlikely* to take it into their heads to admit of a *quiet separation* of their infant-children from themselves, at their submitting to the initial rite.

They were, of all people, the *most unlikely* to part with their children, or separate from them, or receive the rite without them: — For, they never had been told, that their *infants* had no right; and if they had, *much more* satisfaction must have been given them, than what does appear from the New Testament history, or they would never have consented to such a *separation* of themselves from their children. — But the *contrary* appears to have been the case, and stands confirmed by the baptism of *households*, upon the profession of their heads.

Neither is it to be supposed, that this 3000 was *plunged*: The *law of Decency*, as well as that of using the *water of separation*, forbid it: And, of consequence, the prepositions *apo*, and *ex*, may be well understood, when related to *Christian baptism*, as only expressive of coming *from* the water, *by* or *in* which

which they had been *baptized*, but not *plunged*: Some water having been applied to their bodies, and not their bodies to the water.

The *Baptists*, as they call themselves, are properly *dippers*, but not *baptizers*. And that application of water, which they call *rantizing* or *baby-sprinkling*, is most truly and properly *baptizing*. — “ Our Anti-
“ *paedobaptists* are *Sebaptizers*,” says a late writer. (o)
— They do indeed, *in part*, dip themselves, by going *into* the water. They dip a *part* of themselves, and assist the minister in dipping the *other part*.

The *above writer* “ has challenged the most learned
“ of the *Antipaedobaptists* to produce any clear
“ evidence of *baptism* being administer’d by *dipping*,
“ in the primitive times, or before the close of the
“ II^d century; about which time *crossing*, *anointing*,
“ &c. came in.” (p)

And farther, it would be worth Mr. B.’s while to remove the force of argument which lies against the *Antipaedobaptists*; in that late Tract, call’d, *a Review and Vindication*, &c. p. 29, 30. where this question is asked, “ When and where, then, did the first
“ *Antipaedobaptists* appear ? ” He answers, “ In
“ *Germany*, about, or little more than 200 years
“ since. — *Cyprian*, indeed, with other *antients*, were
“ a kind of *Anabaptists*: They pleaded for *re-bap-*
“ *tizing* in some cases. But (some of the old *Mon-*
“ *tanists* excepted) *Antipaedobaptists* there were none,
“ or none that we can plainly and certainly disco-
“ ver, before the XVIth century; and none of
“ any account for *learning* and *piety*, or either, before
“ the last. *This witness is true; and what none of our*
“ *ANTI-PAEDO-BAPTISTS*, with all their abilities and
“ *zeal, can fairly disprove.*”

(o) *A Treatise on the Subjects*, &c. p. 54.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 51. *Review*, &c. p. 55.

Moreover, I have been informed, by a *worthy gentleman*, who has conversed very familiarly with several of the adult-baptizers in *Holland*, that they do not *plunge*, but only *sprinkle* or *pour on* water ; nay, they reckon, that their *brethren* in *England* do lay an *undue stress* upon plunging. — The author of the *Review and Vindication*, &c. has likewise taken notice of this, p. 30. Note (z) — Total immersion is not essential in the sense of “ *foreign Antipaedobaptists*, “ who, it is said, baptize by *sprinkling*, or *pouring on* “ of water.”

I would then, before I conclude, ask Mr. B. this question, — If *plunging* be an *essential* to baptism ; and baptism only to be applied to adult-persons ; so that none but *such* persons, *so* baptized, do make a profession of their *own faith*, or are *visible* members of *Christ's church*, — What must we esteem *foreign Antipaedobaptists*, and all others, who come short of this standard ? Shall we *unchristianize* all but the almost *imperceptible* few, who have submitted to be *dipped* in adult-age ? Shall we deny, that a number of Mr. B.'s *bearers*, and *thousands* of others, who attend *public worship*, in other societies of his denomination, but are not dipped ; shall we deny, that these make any profession of their *own faith* ? and that the *faith* and *repentance* of all Paedobaptists is *invalid*, without a *rebaptization by plunging* ?

Methinks there is much more *arrogancy* in such an insinuation, than any good man, in a cool thought, can approve : For it seems, that tho' men *believe* in *Christ*, and do *love* and *honour* him ; yea, have, as they think, been initiated into his church, by *baptism* ; yet, if they do not *renounce* that their baptism, and submit to be *plunged*, in Mr. B.'s way, they have made *no profession of their own faith*, nor are they *visible* members of *Christ's church*.

Dr. Gale has said nothing less than Mr. B. — See his *Reflections*, &c. p. 80, 81. where he concludes, “ That none are baptized, but believers, dipped into the water ; and that such who are not so baptized, are not rightly initiated ; and have no title to church-membership, but should be disclaimed.”

Upon the whole, I presume this to be a fair conclusion, that all *assuming airs* and *pretensions* to undoubted evidence in favour of a *mode*, which has nothing to support it, either *from former dispensations*, or from *reason*, or from the *Gospel*, [as I hope I have shewn *plunging in baptism* has not] all such *airs* had much better be laid aside ; and, at least, the *plunging-baptizers* should allow, that those who *differ* from them, may differ with as much *reason*, as much *integrity*, and with as good *understandings* as they themselves differ from others.

To conclude. I am aware that controversies among *Christians* have generally a very bad effect in making divisions *wider*, by *beighting* animosities, and exciting uncharitable dispositions towards one another ; and that true morality, the *spirit* and *life* of religion, has thereby extremely suffered. But as I have not offered any thing knowingly that is unworthy the *Christian* character ; and have an ardent desire of being found myself holding *the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace* ; so, I humbly hope, I have given to no one any *just reason* of offence. I am conscious of an affectionate esteem for all good men, who differ from me in the spirit of charity. At the *same time*, I abhor *bigotry* in any, as it has been productive of the most *direful effects* in religious societies ; and, so far as it prevails, *spoils* the best tempers, and *sullies* the glory of the most pious characters.

I would take leave of the controversy, by offering up that prayer of the Apostle's : — *Now the*
God

God of patience and consolation, grant us to be like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus, that with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. — Receiving one another, as Christ also receiveth us, to the glory of God.

FINIS



to receive. I am not a controversialist among
 Christians have honestly and effect in making
 divisions among us, and exciting
 uncharitable feelings, and
 that the true religion, has
 thereby exposed, and have not of-
 fered any thing worthy the
 Christian character, or the desire of
 being found in the spirit in
 the land of peace, hope, I have given
 to no one any reason, I am conscious
 of an affectionate esteem for all good men, who dis-
 tinguish me in the spirit of charity. At the same
 time, I abhor every in any, as it has been produc-
 tive of the most harmful effects in religious societies;
 and, so far as it prevails, holds the best tempers, and
 the glory of the most pious characters.
 I would take leave of the controversy, by offer-
 ing up that prayer of the Apostle's: — Now the